



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

Written Feedback

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Volume #4

April 2024



Sub #	Organisation Name	Page Number
26410	Kohimarama Tennis Club	2027



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

to reduce house price and rental house rents

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

Reduce inflation and living cost



#15364



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

easier to do transport

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

Easier transport and easier to register into the system

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

nothing

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

You may have to be involved with the risk is a problem with managing the funds

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



#15364



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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

Nothing in particular

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

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook 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:



#15364



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>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>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>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>	



#15364



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Manurewa Local Board Priorities

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

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

Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development.	
Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention.	
Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community	



#15364



participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants.	
Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action.	
Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities.	
Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active.	
Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park.	
Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts.	

Tell us why

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

I support all priorities

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15374



I don't know

Tell us why:

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

No

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

No

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

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:



#15374



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#15374



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



#15374



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

-

Local board priorities

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

Māngere-Ōtāhuhu

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15414



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland needs better transport system

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#15414



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<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 from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#15414



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	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.	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?



#15414



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15509



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

I don't know



#15509



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>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>Support</p>



#15509



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	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?



#15509



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15521



Tell us why:

I support the introduction of congestion charges

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#15521



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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	



#15521



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?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki



#15521



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living wage Council



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



#15595



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?

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15595



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>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>Support</p>



#15595



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



#15595



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15597



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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



#15597



Tell us here:

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



#15597



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15602



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

I don't know



#15602



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>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>Support</p>



#15602



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#15602



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

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

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

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	
Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.	
Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.	
Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.	
Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).	



#15602



Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.

not enough info

Tell us why

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

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15618



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#15618



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

Tell us here:

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



#15618



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15623



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#15623



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

Tell us here:

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



#15623



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15675



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

I am utterly opposed to privatisation of city assets. I view it as diverting money into the pockets of private ownership. This asset will only grow in value, enable us to borrow on it, and make money for the city forever. I saw what happened to our railway system. Asset tripped. And here we are, still recovering from the predation and financially hamstrung by right wing groups determined to strangle it so they can say they are forced to sell it. And what for? For a short term financial hit and a lost asset and future cash flow and profits. FOREVER! Do not allow this



#15675



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

We need to increase rates, but more importantly, we need to change our funding base which is woefully inadequate. I would like this Council to work with this government, or any party that will do this. Only the government can do this. Put pressure on them, There are lots of better ways to do this and lots of better minds than me that can make better proposals. They are around. Bernard Hickey's ideas are an example. Mayor Brown should not be championing old outdated ideas that failed last and you only need to look at Great Britain to see the disaster that his policies will bring.

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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.



#15675



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

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



#15675



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15676



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

So profit stay in the country

4c. If the council group continues to 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:



#15676



Anything that profits New Zealand helps the people of New Zealand

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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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</p>	



#15676



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?



#15676



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15690



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?

I don't know

Tell us here:

As already mentioned most of A but give ownership and operation partnership to Ngati Wjhatua

4c. If the council group continues to 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:



#15690



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

Tell us here:

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



#15690



<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?

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Not at the moment

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



#15717



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?

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?



#15717



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<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>Support</p>



#15717



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	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.	Support

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

no



#15717



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#15733



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Affordable train system & bus routes

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?



#15733



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<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>Support</p>



#15733



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	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.	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?



#15733



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15738



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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



#15738



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

Tell us here:

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



#15738



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15754



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15754



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

Tell us here:

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



#15754



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15832



Tell us why:

I oppose the introduction of congestion charges

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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?



#15832



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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	



#15832



reduce the need to 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?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki



#15832



8. Do you have any other comments?

I support Auckland Council becoming an accredited Living wage Council



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15836



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

With the port looking at giving the council 1 million dollars a week over a 30 year period is far more than the 3 billion dollars over a 30 year period. ***** ridiculous just do the math. Auckland rate payers will benefit more keeping ownership of the Ports. If the council want to build infrastructure get property developers to install their own micro water treatment plants on their complex sites.

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



#15836



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#15836



<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?



#15836



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Other

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

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

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

The three options (central, more, & less) proposed in the consultation are not the only options, the same goes for the corresponding rates rises. For example, we could get much-needed investment in transport services and climate resilience, as stated under the ‘pay more get more’ option, with a rate rise of less than 14% in year one. There are



#15874



other areas where savings could be made which are not interdependent. The 'overall direction' oversimplifies very complex decisions.

We must prioritise looking after our people and planet by investing in the things that provide us with life's essentials, such as fresh air, clean drinking water, hazard resilient landscapes and basic needs, like accessible transport and a sustainable waste network.

Where I'd like Auckland Council to do/spend more

- Public Transport - Ensure public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable, prioritising investment in public transport infrastructure over road spending.
- Active Transport - Urgently transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.
- Water Quality - Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.
- Environment and Regulation - Ensure appropriate funding is allocated to increase monitoring activity of current/active and future resource consents to enable better environmental outcomes.

I would like to see a LOT more funding towards community conservation, especially initiatives like South East Wildlink.

And better public bin service around Auckland (splitting out recycling and waste bins)

As well as the options provided in the structured consultation, I would also like the Council to do more of the following:

- Protecting and working with communities by continuing to prioritise the funding and delivery of Making Space for Water in partnership with Central Government.
- Ensuring adequate support for community and social services, including contestable grants (such as the Climate Action Grant), the Live Lightly programme, the Communities in Need programme, and supporting work on Council land and marae. This can be achieved by re-establishing pre-2023/2024 budget funding for these areas.
- Supporting frontline, volunteer powered communities by ensuring local boards are adequately funded and grants are available. Grants and investment into community-led services provide great value to Aucklanders. For every dollar that Council invests we get back many more volunteer hours.



#15874



- Supporting moves to a circular economy and zero waste, ensuring waste materials are seen as resources to be reused, repaired, repurposed and recycled, and are diverted from landfill.
- Lowering emissions by becoming a leader in localised renewable energy generation by enabling local integrated energy solutions to support community owned energy groups.

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Auckland Council's Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway sets out actions required to reduce the region's transport emissions by 64% by the year 2030. Transport is the biggest emitter contributing to over 40% of the region's total emissions. Within the transport emissions, 86% come from road transport. This sets a clear directive. We need to get people out of private cars, into buses, trains and ferries and onto cycleways. Failing to understand and action this will result in a continuation of over investment in roading projects and underinvestment in the public and active transport networks. The evidence is there and the evidence is clear.

Regarding the Mayoral proposal, I am encouraged to see initiatives to make public transport more accessible, such as the \$50 weekly cap and introduction of diverse payment options. Another positive is the work programmes which look to improve public transport services, such as network optimisation, expansion of the electric train fleet and completion of the City Rail Link. Unfortunately, alongside these positives, there are some concerns. A couple of examples are; the removal of 'low performing' bus services, and the several references to roading focused projects.

As well as continuing to invest and improve our public transport network, it is essential that the Council urgently supports the transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.

Cutting "low-value initiatives, including raised pedestrian crossings and expensive gold-plated cycleways" is an ideological move that fails to align with the Council's own



#15874



Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway. In monetary terms, this means cutting funding for cycleways by \$141.5 million. This makes no sense as we know increasing funding for active transport infrastructure is a smart investment that can benefit the economy, the environment, and public health. Cycling is a low-cost, low-carbon and low-impact mode of transport that can reduce congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. Cycling also promotes daily, incidental physical activity, mental wellbeing and social inclusion. By improving the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of walking and cycling, more people will be encouraged to choose it as a regular means of travel, creating a virtuous cycle of benefits. This approach also creates better use of existing roading assets by making space for those who cannot choose cycling, walking or public transport.

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

I want Auckland Council to spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as cycleways.

I want Auckland Council to spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable.

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

I want Auckland Council to spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

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)?



#15874



Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#15874



<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>Other</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>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>Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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>	



#15874



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

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

Re-establish the full funding of the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Revenue gained from NETR affects the delivery of essential projects to protect our biodiversity and taonga species. For example, the rate funds kauri dieback track upgrades, treatment support for landowners with kauri dieback, monitoring of the health of our forests and education for visitors to prevent further spread of the disease and predator control on our islands and the mainland. This work supports the health of our environment, which we need to be healthy to keep humans healthy, by filtering our water, catching and intercepting rainfall, holding our soils and slopes together and cleaning our air. Having spent years with large parts of the track network closed to protect kauri it is important to ensure this work continues as planned to enable safe access to our wild places, which are so important for our mental and physical health, and the health of our forests.

Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Manurewa Local Board Priorities

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

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



#15874



Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development.	
Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention.	
Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants.	
Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action.	
Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities.	
Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active.	
Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park.	
Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts.	

Tell us why

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

Other



#15874



Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

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

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

<p>Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.</p>	
<p>Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.</p>	
<p>Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.</p>	
<p>Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.</p>	
<p>Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).</p>	
<p>Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and support for community driven environmental work (e.g., habitat restoration, plant and animal pest control).



#15874



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and support for community groups that focus on climate action (e.g., waste, active transport, education, etc). • Growth of active transport networks such as cycleways and walkways. • Establishment and development of green corridors. • Development and implementation of Climate Action Plans. • Circular economy strategies and actions. <p>Grants and investment into community services provide great value to Aucklanders. For every dollar that the council invests we get back many more volunteer hours. Many boards invest a significant amount into support for local community conservation to protect taonga species or landscapes. Efforts like these are important for both nature and communities, enabling and empowering residents to take action for themselves, increasing ownership of our environmental challenges across the community, resulting in more long-term sustainability for conservation activity.</p>
--	--

Tell us why

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

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the



#15874



Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

8. Do you have any other comments?

Resources for management of trees

Management of Auckland's natural assets (trees) is grossly underfunded. The outcome of The Tree Council's judicial review of the decision in Nov 2020 not to invest in the management of the Notable Trees Schedule is still not being implemented in this Long-Term Plan. In order to fulfill Council's statutory obligations regarding management of the Notable Trees Schedule there is an urgent need to:

- Increase resources for the evaluation of nominations for scheduling of Notable Trees so that these are done promptly. Council has only just completed the evaluation of nominations received prior to Nov 2020. There is no funding allocation for evaluation of nominations received since. Failing to evaluate nominations will be a breach of the judicial review settlement agreement and will risk court enforcement action. Members of the public nominating trees for scheduling have a right to expect their nominations to be progressed and evaluated promptly, not filed in a drawer until some unknown future date;
- Provide resources for the review of Unitary Plan criteria regarding scheduling of Notable Trees;
- Provide resources for a review of other ways to protect urban trees in the absence of the Natural & Built Environment Act;
- Provide resources for a review of Significant Ecological Areas and addition of new sites qualifying as SEAs;
- Provide resources for finding trees that should be added to the Schedule of Notable Trees.
- Provide resources to implement the Urban Ngahere Strategy

o Plant more trees

o Monitor coverage & structure of tree canopy

Resources for treatment of infected kauri on public land



#15874



Auckland Council has used the Natural Environment Targeted Rate to invest in upgrading infrastructure in order to re-open tracks closed to prevent the spread of kauri dieback and enable the public to re-enter the forest in a safe way. This is great, however there has been no investment to date in treating the trees in the infected areas and without treatment 100% of infected kauri will die. This will result in these beautiful new tracks being closed for safety reasons as they will be surrounded by dead and dying kauri. Within a decade the majority of these trees will be dead. In places like the Cascades where the forest is at a tipping point now this could happen much sooner. Removal of dead trees around tracks will become a significant financial liability for Council. It is therefore essential that urgent funding is provided to:

- Resource treatment by phosphite and monitoring of kauri dieback infected trees on public land in Regional & Local Parks;
- Critical areas with taonga trees to be prioritised (eg Cascades, Spraggs Bush, Arataki Nature Trail) but also where infrastructure upgrades have occurred or are planned (eg Hillary Trail, Fairy Falls);
- Treatment will need to be repeated when monitoring indicates return of symptoms (there is no cure for kauri dieback) probably after approx 5 years, so a rolling programme of treatment and monitoring work needs to be planned now.
- Support Option 4 for NETR (Options 1 & 2 reduced kauri dieback control, track maintenance. No new kauri research or monitoring. Option 4 provides for kauri tracks meeting standards and remaining open to public). Cost of treatment of kauri is not included in any of these options, hence the need for 2.2.1-3.

Resources for restoring biodiversity health

Supporting biodiversity and ecological health in Auckland's major forest areas (Hunua & Waitākere Ranges) is essential for the health of the entire region. Treatment of air pollution, provision of clean drinking water, recreation and wellbeing services for the population are just some of the benefits provided by these vital assets. In order to keep them healthy it is essential that funding is provided for:

- Resourcing landscape scale predator control in closed areas of Waitākere Ranges;
- Resourcing a repeat of landscape scale predator control in Hunua Ranges;
- Resourcing mana whenua to look after the land, sea, freshwater & all that lives in and on it within their rohe;
- Resourcing community groups that undertake weed, predator and pest control on public and private land throughout the region. Access to grant funding to support paid coordinators and underpin this work (which Council cannot afford to resource doing



#15874



itself) is essential to ensuring this voluntary workforce is able to continue to undertake this work.

- Support Option 4 for NETR (Options 1 & 2 reduced support for community groups, supply of traps etc, reduced revegetation. Options 1&2, reduced level of management of priority eco-systems. Option 4 adds funding for community-led landscape scale pest control.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15911



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

I do not want the privatisation of the Port of Auckland.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15911



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

Tell us here:

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



#15911



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15918



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:



#15918



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

Tell us here:

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



#15918



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#15963



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?

Other

Tell us here:

Do not understand

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:



#15963



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

Tell us here:

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



#15963



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16073



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Stop selling the family jewels, income from the ports needs to stay in NZ and not be exported.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16073



Tell us here:

Invest in Auckland in the long term

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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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</p>	



#16073



reduce the need to 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?



#16073



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16095



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

I did security at Ports of Auckland and privatisation is not the best for the workers and Auckland City

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16095



Tell us here:

Auckland needs the income provided by Ports of Auckland and it will bring prices down.

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

Tell us here:

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

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>	



#16095



<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?



#16095



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16143



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Short term gain for long term pain

4c. If the council group continues to 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:



#16143



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

Tell us here:

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



#16143



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16145



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

Stop privatisation, not a cash cow it's public ownership for Auckland we are paying more than ever.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16145



Tell us here:

Parks-recreation. Regrowth of natives in parks. Invest in the people of Auckland.
Accommodations for senior citizens

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

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>	



#16145



<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?



#16145



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16160



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

I believe an asset like the ports is critically important to retain ownership of for the ongoing benefit of the city and the country Selling/ long term leasing would not benefit Auckland city, all profits would be taken off shore. That's how corporate business works.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16160



Tell us here:

Funds should be used to help the city and offset inflation costs.

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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.	



#16160



<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?



#16160



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16187



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#16187



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

Tell us here:

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



#16187



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16252



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

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:

The council needs to retain the land it owns of Auckland. It is the backbone of Auckland and needs to be in public ownership as more and more private organisations focus on short term gains at the expense of the future of the city and its citizens.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16252



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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</p>	



#16252



reduce the need to 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?



#16252



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16301



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#16301



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

Tell us here:

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



#16301



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#16394



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?

Tell us why:

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



#16394



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

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>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>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#16394



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid 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.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

no

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



#16417



no

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Its good to have money by stopping investment plan such as bump many speed camaras etc

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

no

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

no

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Because this may help to enhance cash return to auckland council which will help council to fun public services



#16417



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

the future investment will benefits the young generation

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

Tell us here:

no

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:



#16417



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 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>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>Do not 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>Do not support</p>



#16417



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Franklin

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#16432



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#16432



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



#16432



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



#16512



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#16512



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



#16512



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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



#16517



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16517



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#16517



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki,Papakura



#16517



Manurewa Local Board Priorities

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

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

Continue to support, deliver and fund initiatives that contribute to positive youth development.	
Invest in evidence-based projects that focus on crime prevention, safer communities and injury prevention.	
Fund and support activities that include older people and foster their community participation with a specific focus on reaching older migrants.	
Invest in community led projects and initiatives that respond to social connection and cohesion, build climate resilience and contribute to climate action.	
Develop a masterplan for Mountfort Park to ensure our open space and sports field network meets the demands of our diverse communities.	
Identify options for recreational activities to support people of all ages and abilities being casually active.	
Investigate community lease options to support Ngāti Tamaoho aspirations for a cultural hub at Te Pua/Keith Park.	
Investigate the feasibility of an arts broker programme to nurture creative expression with a focus on supporting Māori and Pacific creative arts.	



#16517



Tell us why

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

I do not support most priorities

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

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

Not Important

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

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	Not Important
Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.	Not Important
Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.	Fairly Important
Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.	Not Important
Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in	Not Important



#16517



schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).	
Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.	

Tell us why

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

Do not support

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

Papakura Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which	Not Important
--	---------------



#16517



we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	Fairly Important
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	Not Important
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	Not Important
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	Not Important

Tell us why

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Public Transport train can't be on-time and every saturday sunday stop operating, hope Govt enforce management.

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



#16809



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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#16809



4c. If the council group continues to 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#16809



<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>	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>	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>	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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know



#16809



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

The green little rubbish bin is a waste, should be cancelled.

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

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



#17240



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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:



#17240



4c. If the council group continues to 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.

Do not support



#17240



<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>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>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>I don't know</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>I don't know</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>



#17240



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Howick

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Reduce the rate of increase in electricity and water fees, and decrease the rate of increase in property taxes.



#17241



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

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

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and 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:



#17241



4c. If the council group continues to 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.	Do not support
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



#17241



<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>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>I don't know</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>



#17241



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?

Suggest establishing affordable parking lots in the vicinity of the city center and connecting them to the city center with reasonable bus routes to alleviate the problem of parking difficulty in the city center."



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17271



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:

Current facility is good enough

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



#17271



4c. If the council group continues to 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



#17271



<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>	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



#17271



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

Local board priorities

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

Howick

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Culture, art, public transportation

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



#17664



government housing project

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Unable to comment due to lack of documentation

2a. Is there anything you 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 needed

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know



#17664



Tell us here:

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#17664



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



#17664



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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



#17723



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:



#17723



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	Support



#17723



<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>	
<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>	Support



#17723



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#17764



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:

Limited tax revenue for stadiums with (low) demand

It is not appropriate to distribute

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

Sufficient return on investment (at least 7.5%) by the nominated organization, as set by the City Council.

There is uncertainty about whether to achieve this, and transparency in fund management is

difficult to guarantee

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



#17764



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:

If privatization takes place in the form of leasing, port fees will eventually increase significantly for profitability.

will increase, with private development/operation benefits rather than the public nature of the port.

Because it will come to an end.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

There will be no additional cost to the council and the port

Because it does not affect operating value

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



#17764



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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#17764



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Cut surplus management and non-core projects

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



#17807



Reduce the frequency of public events that have low attendance to save on costs., Cut back on expensive consultancy services and rely more on in-house expertise., Streamline council operations to reduce administrative costs without affecting service quality.

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?

No

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

Pedestrian paths where there's not much foot traffic., Use quiet paths for cycleways

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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



#17807



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the 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</p>	



#17807



<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?



#17807



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

Improve maintenance and add more facilities in public parks for better recreational spaces., Provide additional resources and support for local cultural events to enrich community life.

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



#17815



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?

Roads that are in good shape., Safe paths for walking and cycling., Green, eco-friendly travel options

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

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

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)?

Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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



#17815



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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	



#17815



reduce the need to 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?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki



#17815



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#17850



Tell us why:

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:



#17850



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



#17850



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#18005



Tell us why:

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

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:



#18005



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



#18005



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18741



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18741



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18741



<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>	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



#18741



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

Care about people's livelihood.

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

Fees be less.



#18749



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?

Pay more superannuation.

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

Less inflation.

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:



#18749



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18749



<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>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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>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>Other</p>



#18749



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Protection of environment

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

Reduce the burden.



#18751



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?

Improve the quality of service.

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

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

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

Tell us why:

To change the way of operation in order to increase income.

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18751



Guarantee it is operating.

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the 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?

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18751



<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>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>Other</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>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>Other</p>



#18751



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

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

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

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	
Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.	
Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.	
Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.	
Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and	



#18751



<p>climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).</p>	
<p>Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.</p>	<p>Regarding to the regional board's plan to work out.</p>

Tell us why

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

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Safety and security

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



#18764



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Transport becomes more convenient

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18764



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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>Do not support</p>



#18764



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

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



#18764



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Strictly control crime! Robbery.

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

No



#18767



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

Combat crime.

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18767



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18767



<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>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>Do not support</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>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>



#18767



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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?

Strictly combat crime! Robbery

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

No



#18770



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Combat crime.

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18770



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18770



<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>	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>	
<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



#18770



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

Safety and Security



#18773



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?

Transport getting more Convenient.

2b. Is there 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:



#18773



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems 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	Do not support



#18773



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know



#18773



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Control inflation.

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

Pay less for funding of large events.



#18782



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18782



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:

I trust country's leader authority's decision.

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

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

Tell us why:

This option is better.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#18782



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



#18782



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

Support

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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18790



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



#18790



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>



#18790



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#18790



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know



#18792



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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



#18792



Tell us here:

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



#18792



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

free dental visits

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



#18794



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Prioritised Network

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

make traffic more smooth.

2b. Is there 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:

Keeping this status is better

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

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



#18794



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

It's beneficial to Akl long term development

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Support



#18794



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



#18794



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

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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Do less (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	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?

Hit crime hard! Robbery.

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



#18796



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?

Combat crime

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us here:



#18796



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18796



<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>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>Do not support</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>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>



#18796



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

Safety and security

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



#18797



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

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

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:



#18797



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18797



<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>	Do not support



#18797



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18800



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?



#18800



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>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>



#18800



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



#18800



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Health- reduce waiting time

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

Less increase of water bills, electricity, land tax



#18802



2. What do you think of the transport 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us here:

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



#18802



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18802



<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>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>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>

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



#18802



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

Health- Short waiting time

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

Don't raise land tax



#18809



2. What do you think of the transport 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?

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:



#18809



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18809



<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>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>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>I don't know</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>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>



#18809



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#18816



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?

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



#18816



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>



#18816



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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.	

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



#18816



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18819



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



#18819



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Other

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>



#18819



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#18819



Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Enhance public transport, beneficial to city's development great to reduce carbon pollution

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



#18821



Councils members salaries should not be too high

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Prioritise traffic network reduce the demand of regulation

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

Road traffic more free flow.

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

Reduce parking by the road, let road use more smoothly

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:

I agree this can increase city council income better for city development services.

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



#18821



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:

Beneficial of all the funds and their use

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

Council services will be much better

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

Beneficial to residents

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



#18821



Tell us why:

Beneficial to residents

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18821



Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin 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?

Basic support

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

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

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

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	
--	--



#18821



<p>Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.</p>	
<p>Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.</p>	
<p>Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.</p>	
<p>Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).</p>	
<p>Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.</p>	<p>Water quality guarantee is very important. So water quality and land tax should be kept.</p>

Tell us why

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

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the



#18821



Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

8. Do you have any other comments?

Climate action, transport, land tax is beneficial to enhance public transport service. It is necessary to use.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Safety and security

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



#18823



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?

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?

Other

Tell us here:



#18823



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18823



<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>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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>	



#18823



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

Solve traffic congestion. Solve public housing, increase in rental prices and inflation

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



#18824



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

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:



#18824



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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#18824



<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>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>I don't know</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>



#18824



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

Local board priorities

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

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#18825



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#18825



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

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>
<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>



#18825



<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>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>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>

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#18825



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#18829



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a 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



#18829



<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>	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>	I don't know
<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



#18829



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#18831



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

Create public benefits.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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	



#18831



<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>Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other 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>	



#18831



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	
Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.	
Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.	
Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.	
Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and	



#18831



<p>climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).</p>	
<p>Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.</p>	<p>Some situations I don't understand.</p>

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?

Tell us why

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I hope council do more that let the society moves forward and beneficial to elderly

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less tax



#18835



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Other

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

Govt should think about services to be more comment for our community members.



#18835



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#18835



<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>	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>	I don't know
<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



#18835



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?

Need to solve the problem of traffic congestion urgently, road infrastructure needs to do more

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Society security has to be done more. Do more on youth law education, avoiding the growing number of crimes.



#18836



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?

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:



#18836



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?

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</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#18836



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#18836



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#18908



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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



#18908



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>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>Support</p>



#18908



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin 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?



#18908



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	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?

whatever the option is- Please try to improve transport system especially "Watercare"

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stick to proposed plan- to have the project fully accomplished.



#18910



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Transport system and water care

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

To make Auckland proud across the globe.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

Do or make the correct decisions for benefit of Auckland city council



#18910



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:

City councillors must decide on the best options

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>Support</p>
---	----------------



#18910



<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>Other</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>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>Other</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>Other</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>Other</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>Other</p>



#18910



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18915



Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#18915



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<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 from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#18915



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#18915



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#18921



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?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#18921



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>



#18921



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#18921



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?

No other comments. we still have to follow whatever the council does.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Increase the minimum income tax rate and increase the maximum tax rate by one more step.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#18924



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#18924



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#18924



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18925



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:

I don't live in Northshore.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Looking for the long term if the airport is privatised in the next 10 years, after 10 to 20 years how to deal with it? City Council should hold this important informative rate, then prioritise.

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



#18925



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

I don't trust the operating personal of Auckland future fund can use the funds to earn income, to keep the good operation of fund.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

I don't trust Auckland Council can use the land better. Commercial operation should let professionals to handle to create economic benefit.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

From the media, we will get rate recession, without economic income, how to operate more public items so in the in the recession, should keep commercial operation of the items.



#18925



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>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>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>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>I don't know</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>



#18925



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Maungakiekie-Tāmaki in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support community groups and community-led activities by continuing to provide local community grants.	
Building the capacity and capability of local community and sporting groups towards long-term sustainable funding models and independence through our strategic partnerships programme.	



#18925



Empowering community groups and organisations to deliver community events through sustainable funding models.	
Collaborate with mana whenua and neighbouring local boards to protect and restore our waterways through Tāmaki Estuary Environmental Forum and Manukau Harbour Forum.	
Encourage our rangatahi / youth and community to be leaders in climate action. For example, through programmes like Tiakina te taiao and Ope (biodiversity and climate action education programme in schools), Love Your Neighbourhood (environmental volunteer grants) and Songbird programmes (community pest control and biodiversity initiative).	
Support business associations to continue supporting local businesses and ongoing growth, development and liveliness of town centres, including assisting Onehunga Business Associations proposed BID expansion.	I just came less than six months, not familiar with these, don't have any opinions.

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Maungakiekie-Tāmaki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. Onehunga Business Association is seeking an expansion of its Business Improvement District programme boundary area. If it is successful, businesses ratepayers and owners located within the expansion area will become members of the Onehunga BID programme and pay the associated BID target rate.

Do you support the expansion of the Onehunga Business Improvement District (BID) programme and associated BID targeted rate?



#18925



Tell us why

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#18929



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:



#18929



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>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>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>Support</p>



#18929



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki



#18929



8. Do you have any other comments?

Rate for only house owner, it means not fair because the people do not have a house they didn't have to pay rates. It should be the different rates for income.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



#18931



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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



#18931



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>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>Support</p>



#18931



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#18931



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do more for water management, bring up productively

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Land tax



#19003



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?

Protect road. increase technology and reduce man power

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:



#19003



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#19003



<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>Do not 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>Do not support</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</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#19003



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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	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?

very helpful to community

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Not every one goes to CBD. Benefit less people



#19005



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

City council fund is limited

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Stadium not used very often

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

manage funds better

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#19005



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#19005



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	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



#19005



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?

City council use funds cleverly



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more public transport network

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#19015



Less on state housing. Especially state housing nearby a major public transport.
Normal people can't even afford to live here. Why would non-tax payers live there.
They don't even have a job to go to.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Public transport reliability networks

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

cycleways

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

Proceed with proposal, however keep some of aial shares. don't sell all

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#19015



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Portland is a piece of highly strategic area. Hence it's such a waste to use it as a port- Adding more congestion in CBD with lots of contained trucks etc. Please use land for something else.



#19015



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>	Do not support
<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>	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>	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>	



#19015



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do not reduce funding too much needed services for events in neighbourhoods with people already struggling financially. Reduced fares for public transport.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#19091



Stop expanding/ working on new roads and unnecessary new big projects i.e. stadium, yes- focus on public not projects that encourage more private vehicle.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Encourage more people to use public transport by reducing fees- Capped prices would be good.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Make them good value so people start use busses/trains everyday.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

I have no idea how successful it is as I don't use these and never been.

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an 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:



#19091



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:



#19091



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 from what 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>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>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>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></p>



#19091



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#19218



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#19218



4c. If the council group continues to 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



#19218



<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



#19218



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?

Subsidy support for local medical facilities



#19222



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

Auckland Airport should never be sold.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#19222



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	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	Support



#19222



<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>	I don't know
<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



#19222



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#19224



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#19224



4c. If the council group continues to 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:

Reducing the scale of port operations is likely to cause traffic congestion and disruption in logistics transportation.

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



#19224



<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>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></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</p>	<p>Support</p>



#19224



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improving water quality, preventing flood damage

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#19231



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:



#19231



4c. If the council group continues to 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



#19231



<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



#19231



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?

We hope to continue to support community groups with different languages and cultures. If the city council connects with community groups to share its policies, vision, and social enlightenment activities, there will be positive aspects in terms of cost reduction and voluntary citizen awareness enhancement.



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	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?

road maintenance



#19244



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

I am afraid that I will lose the real ownership of Nz.

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#19244



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a 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



#19244



<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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know



#19244



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#19248



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#19248



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19248



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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 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?



#19249



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#19249



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19249



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#19257



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#19257



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19257



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#19260



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#19260



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19260



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#19262



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?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#19262



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?

<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 from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#19262



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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.	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?



#19262



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19393



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19393



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19393



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19422



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19422



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19422



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19444



Tell us why:

Epi Timu

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19444



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19444



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19454



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19454



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19454



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19465



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19465



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19465



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19471



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19471



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19471



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19479



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19479



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19479



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19501



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19501



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19501



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19735



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19735



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19735



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19738



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19738



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19738



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19740



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19740



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19740



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19741



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19741



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19741



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19743



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19743



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19743



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19765



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19765



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19765



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19769



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19769



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19769



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19780



Tell us why:

Agreement

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19780



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19780



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19782



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19782



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19782



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19784



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19784



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19784



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19785



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19785



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19785



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#19789



Tell us why:

Agreement

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#19789



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#19789



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20044



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20044



Tell us why:

I LOVE TO SUPPORT ITS GOOD FOR THE COMMUNITY AND FOR EVERYONE IT HELPS US COZ IF THE CAR BREAK DOWN THEN WE USE THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT. THE MOST IMPORTANT THING ITS EASY AND FAST.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20044



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20044



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20054



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20054



Tell us why:

I LOVE TO SUPPORT ITS GOOD FOR THE COMMUNITY AND FOR EVERYONE IT HELPS US COZ IF THE CAR BREAK DOWN THEN WE USE THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT. THE MOST IMPORTANT THING ITS EASY AND FAST.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20054



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20054



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20055



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20055



Tell us why:

I LOVE TO SUPPORT ITS GOOD FOR THE COMMUNITY AND FOR EVERYONE IT HELPS US COZ IF THE CAR BREAK DOWN THEN WE USE THE PUBLIC TRANSPORT. THE MOST IMPORTANT THING ITS EASY AND FAST.

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20055



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20055



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#20158



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#20158



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20158



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#20159



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#20159



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20159



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#20177



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:



#20177



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20177



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20209



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#20209



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the 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:



#20209



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20209



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20309



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20309



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20309



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20309



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20311



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20311



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20311



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20313



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20313



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20313



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20314



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20314



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20314



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20315



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20315



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20315



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20316



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20316



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20316



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20317



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20317



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20317



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20318



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20318



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20318



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20319



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20319



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20319



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20320



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20320



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20320



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20321



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20321



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20321



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20322



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20322



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20322



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20323



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20323



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20323



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20324



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20324



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20324



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20324



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20325



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20325



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20325



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20326



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20326



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20326



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20327



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20327



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20327



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20328



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20328



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20328



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20332



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20332



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20332



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20333



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20333



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20333



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20334



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20334



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20334



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20334



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20335



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20335



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20335



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20336



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20336



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20336



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20337



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20337



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20337



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20338



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20338



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20338



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20339



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20339



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20339



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20340



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20340



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20340



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20340



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20341

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20341



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20341



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20341



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20343



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20343



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20343



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20353



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20353



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20353



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20364



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20364



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20364



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20364



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20368

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20368



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20368



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20368



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20379



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20379



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20379



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20380



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20380



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20380



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20380



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20382

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20382



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20382



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20382



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20383



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20383



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20383



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20385



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20385



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20385



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20421



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20421



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20421



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20422

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20422



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20422



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20422



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20423

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20423



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20423



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20423



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20425



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20425



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20425



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20426



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20426



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20426



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20426



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20430



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20430



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20430



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20430



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20433



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20433



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20433



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20433



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20435



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20435



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20435



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20435



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20436



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20436



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20436



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20436



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20437



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20437



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20437



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20438



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20438



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20438



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20438



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20440



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20440



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20440



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20440



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20613



Tell us why:

This is much needed in my generation

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20613



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20613



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support most of the proposal



#20631



Tell us why:

ITS An EASY WAY TO ACCESS AND FAST FOR THOSE WHO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20631



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20631



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support most of the proposal



#20633



Tell us why:

ITS An EASY WAY TO ACCESS AND FAST FOR THOSE WHO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20633



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20633



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20634



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support most of the proposal



#20634



Tell us why:

ITS An EASY WAY TO ACCESS AND FAST FOR THOSE WHO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20634



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20634



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20638



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support most of the proposal



#20638



Tell us why:

ITS An EASY WAY TO ACCESS AND FAST FOR THOSE WHO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20638



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20638



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20639



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support most of the proposal



#20639



Tell us why:

ITS An EASY WAY TO ACCESS AND FAST FOR THOSE WHO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20639



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20639



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support most of the proposal



#20641



Tell us why:

ITS An EASY WAY TO ACCESS AND FAST FOR THOSE WHO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20641



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20641



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20657

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20657



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20657



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20657



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20666



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20666



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20666



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20666



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20668



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20668



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20668



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20668



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20673



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20673



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20673



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20680



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20680



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20680



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20680



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20681



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20681



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20681



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20689



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20689



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20689



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20689



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20700



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20700



Tell us why:

Agree

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20700



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20700



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20709



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Support all of the proposal



#20709



Tell us why:

I CAN'T DRIVE AND I USE PUBLIC TRANSPORT THATS WHYN I SUPPORT THIS.

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#20709



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20709



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20959



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Do not support most of the proposal



#20959



Tell us why:

making public transport faster, more reliable, and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20959



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20959



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20965



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Do not support most of the proposal



#20965



Tell us why:

making public transport faster, more reliable, and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20965



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20965



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20970



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Do not support most of the proposal



#20970



Tell us why:

making public transport faster, more reliable, and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20970



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20970



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Do not support most of the proposal



#20981



Tell us why:

making public transport faster, more reliable, and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20981



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20981



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#20984



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Do not support most of the proposal



#20984



Tell us why:

making public transport faster, more reliable, and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions, such as making it easier to pay and introducing capped weekly public transport passes

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20984



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20984



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?

Do not support most of the proposal



#20987



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#20987



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#20987



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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 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?

Bicycle Ways



#21261



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Buses

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Cycle ways

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:

good investment

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



#21261



Tell us here:

do not give it away

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

Support



#21261



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#21261



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#21294



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21294



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#21294



<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>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>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>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>Do not support</p>



#21294



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#21300



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21300



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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</p>	<p>Support</p>



#21300



<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>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>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>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>Do not support</p>



#21300



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21301



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#21301



<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>	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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know
<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



#21301



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Transport and Road

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Bicycle lane, compost bin collection



#21346



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?

Rural roads

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Bus lanes

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:



#21346



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#21346



<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>	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>	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



#21346



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public security

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#21354



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21354



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#21354



<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>	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>	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>	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



#21354



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Rural Roads

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Bicycle lanes, cancel rubbish collection fee and adopt the "pay as you throw" policy



#21359



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:



#21359



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#21359



<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>	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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know



#21359



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Construction of transportation networks

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Discontinue kitchen compost waste recycling services



#21360



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?

The construction of rural roads.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce investment in bicycle lanes

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know



#21360



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<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>
---	-----------------------



#21360



<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>I don't know</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>



#21360



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Implement a "pay-as-you-throw" garbage service and enforce it across all of Auckland

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21362



Support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?



#21362



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?

<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>



#21362



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	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?



#21362



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Don't support any of the proposal



#21364



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#21364



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. 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>Support</p>



#21364



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	Support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of 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?



#21364



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Transportation networks and library services.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#21366



The service of kitchen compost bins should be discontinued. Relying on manual garbage collection for kitchen compost bins in developed countries in the 21st century is absurd

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?

Reduce investment in bicycle lanes.

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#21366



I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

I don't know



#21366



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#21366



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

I do not support canceling the "pay-as-you-throw" garbage service

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#21368



Don't support any of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#21368



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>
<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>Do not support</p>



#21368



<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>	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>	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



#21368



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21370



I don't know

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

The construction and maintenance of rural roads.

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

The construction and maintenance of bicycle lanes

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:



#21370



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	I don't know



#21370



<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>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>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.</p>	<p>I don't know</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>



#21370



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	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?

Increase investment in intelligent transportation solutions

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Discontinue compost bins and related services



#21371



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Reduce investment in bicycle lanes and discontinue kitchen compost bin services

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?

Other

Tell us here:



#21371



Support quad governance, but do not support the Auckland Future Fund

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Profits are used to offset the land tax paid by the public

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#21371



<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>Do not 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>Do not support</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</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21371



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have 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 support

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21396



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

I don't know

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services



#21396



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#21396



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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.	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?



#21396



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21397



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and 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:



#21397



4c. If the council group continues to 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?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#21397



<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>	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>	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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know



#21397



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21398



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?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21398



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#21398



<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>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>Do not 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>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>



#21398



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#21459



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21459



4c. If the council group continues to 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.	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



#21459



<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>	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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know



#21459



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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?



#21470



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)?

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



#21470



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have 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>



#21470



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#21470



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21542



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?



#21542



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>



#21542



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



#21542



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#21559



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?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#21559



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<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>Do not support</p>



#21559



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the 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?



#21559



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



#21588



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21588



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#21588



<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>Do not 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>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></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>



#21588



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do 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?



#21590



Do not support most of the proposal

Tell us why:

Because only funding was provided, the goals were never truly achieved

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Change the operational management

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:



#21590



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#21590



<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>	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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know
<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>	I don't know



#21590



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,

First, I had great difficulty in obtaining the 10 year plan, the apparent agency server/website my spam protect software would not allow, why was the



#22082



link not on the council website and easy to find. I guess it is because you really do not want rate payers to see all the true extent of grossly wasteful spending proposals.

Secondly, there are other ways to finance infrastructure than rates, one example is Bond issues, another is Public/Private partnerships, another would be eliminating a large proportion of the overpaid top and middle management personnel. It appears these have not been seriously considered.

Finally, 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.



#22082



- 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!’

Yours faithfully

John S Anderson CA

Ratepayer

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,

First, I had great difficulty in obtaining the 10 year plan, the apparent agency server/website my spam protect software would not allow, why was the

link not on the council website and easy to find. I guess is is because you really do not want rate payers to see all the true extent Of grossly wasteful

spending proposals.

Secondly, there are other was to finance infrastructure than rates, one example is Bond issues, another is Public/Private partnerships, onother would



#22082



be eliminating a large proportion of the overpaid top and middle management personnel. It appears these have not been seriously considered.

Finally, 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.



#22082



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease

Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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!'

Yours faithfully

John S Anderson CA

Ratepayer

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22082



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#22082



<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>	



#22082



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,

Reduce waste through large numbers of high paid employees in the council. Central government has the message.... reduce back of house costs and



#22089



keep front line services. How many council employees get \$150,000 or more a year?
That is your answer.

Then build revenue. Do things that increase income.

Thanks

Michael

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,

Reduce waste through large numbers of high paid employees in the council. Central government has the message.... reduce back of house costs and

keep front line services. How many council employees get \$150,000 or more a year?
That is your answer.

Then build revenue. Do things that increase income.

Thanks

Michael

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#22089



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22089



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#22089



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#22091



Year Budget).

Obviously Auckland needs to fund some very overdue infrastructure, while eliminating unnecessary waste. The solution for this should be to negotiate with central government to replace the obsolete fuel tax with a road user tax that can apply to a wider range of vehicles. Future infrastructure won't pay for itself either, for example our city's vehicle fleet is limited until there is a way to charge EVs parked overnight in the street. So let's find an alternative source of city funding.

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).

Obviously Auckland needs to fund some very overdue infrastructure, while eliminating unnecessary waste. The solution for this should be to negotiate with central



#22091



government to replace the obsolete fuel tax with a road user tax that can apply to a wider range of vehicles. Future infrastructure wont pay for itself either, for example our city's vehicle fleet is limited until there is a way to charge EVs parked overnight in the street. So lets find an alternative source of city funding.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22091



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#22091



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property 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>	



#22091



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22113



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22113



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



#22113



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22113



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:



#22113



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>	



#22113



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#22123



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



#22123



roles until an independent review has 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.



#22123



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.



#22123



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22123



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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?



#22123



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#22123



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 the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	



#22123



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22164



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22164



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



#22164



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22164



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:



#22164



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>	



#22164



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#22176



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



#22176



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



#22176



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-



#22176



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#22176



while 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



#22176



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#22176



<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>	



#22176



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22197



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22197



- 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,



#22197



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



#22197



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!’



#22197



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#22197



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 residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	



#22197



<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?



#22197



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22215



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22215



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



#22215



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22215



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:



#22215



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>	



#22215



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22253



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.
- Stop unnecessary marketing exercises and stop building so-called “traffic calming measures” (meaning speed humps and raised pedestrian crossings), and stop lowering speed limits by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#22253



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.

- Stop unnecessary marketing exercises and stop building so-called “traffic calming measures” (meaning speed humps and raised pedestrian crossings),



#22253



and stop lowering speed limits by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22253



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:



#22253



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>	



#22253



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#22255



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



#22255



until an independent review has 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



#22255



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



#22255



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#22255



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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:



#22255



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#22255



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>	



#22255



increased investment in paths in the Franklin 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22272



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22272



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



#22272



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22272



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:



#22272



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>	



#22272



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22303



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22303



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



#22303



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22303



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:



#22303



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>	



#22303



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22323



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22323



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



#22323



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22323



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:



#22323



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>	



#22323



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22340



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!'



#22340



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



#22340



to an expert external operator while 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?



#22340



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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.	
--	--



#22340



<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>	



#22340



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#22369



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



#22369



cutting back office 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



#22369



and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#22369



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 –



#22369



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#22369



higher 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



#22369



operator while 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:



#22369



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#22369



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>	



#22369



increased investment in paths in the Franklin 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22419



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22419



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#22419



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?



#22419



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22419



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#22419



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22471



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should spend ratepayers funds to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22471



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 spend ratepayers funds to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#22471



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22471



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:



#22471



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>	



#22471



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22489



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it

being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office

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.



#22489



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund"

and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#22489



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?



#22489



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22489



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#22489



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?



#22489



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22553



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22553



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



#22553



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22553



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:



#22553



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>	



#22553



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22574



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!'



#22574



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



#22574



to an expert external operator while 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?



#22574



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#22574



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#22574



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22579



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22579



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



#22579



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22579



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:



#22579



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>	



#22579



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#22584



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



#22584



Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#22584



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



#22584



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



#22584



expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and



#22584



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



#22584



humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt



#22584



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



#22584



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#22584



<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>	



#22584



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22629



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22629



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



#22629



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22629



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:



#22629



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>	



#22629



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22635



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22635



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#22635



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?



#22635



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22635



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#22635



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#22646



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#22646



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



#22646



Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#22646



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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).



#22646



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#22646



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#22646



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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:



#22646



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#22646



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>	



#22646



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#22665



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



#22665



Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#22665



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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).



#22665



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#22665



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#22665



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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:



#22665



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#22665



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>	



#22665



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22675



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office 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



#22675



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while 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.



#22675



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office 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



#22675



'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:



#22675



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



#22675



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#22675



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#22678



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:



#22678



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?



#22678



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.



#22678



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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!’



#22678



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22678



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>	



#22678



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#22678



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22681



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22681



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



#22681



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22681



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:



#22681



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>	



#22681



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22763



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office 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



#22763



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while 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.



#22763



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office 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



#22763



'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:



#22763



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	



#22763



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#22763



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22779



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22779



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#22779



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?



#22779



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22779



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#22779



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22807



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22807



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



#22807



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22807



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:



#22807



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>	



#22807



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22881



I reject all three options for rate hikes which have been presented. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should

review its operations to reflect the commitment to efficiency and relevance we have the right to expect as rate payers. The most

expensive option presented is quite frankly outrageous.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation, labelled the “pay

less, get less” option. This makes it sound like we will be missing out, when in fact Council should seriously be reviewing the

services and activities it gets involved in to reduce scope and live within its means delivering core services required by

ratepayers.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reviewing services, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising its focus.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

remuneration levels.

- 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,



#22881



road maintenance rather than building speed bumps all over the city, water management to ensure clean water and effective wastewater and stormwater management.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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 which have been presented. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should

review its operations to reflect the commitment to efficiency and relevance we have the right to expect as rate payers. The most

expensive option presented is quite frankly outrageous.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation, labelled the "pay



#22881



less, get less” option. This makes it sound like we will be missing out, when in fact Council should seriously be reviewing the

services and activities it gets involved in to reduce scope and live within its means delivering core services required by

ratepayers.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reviewing services, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising its focus.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

remuneration levels.

- 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,

road maintenance rather than building speed bumps all over the city, water management to ensure clean water and effective

wastewater and stormwater management.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#22881



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



#22881



Tell us 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	



#22881



<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>	



#22881



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22891



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#22891



higher 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?



#22891



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:



#22891



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?

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:



#22891



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	



#22891



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#22891



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#22904



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22904



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!’



#22904



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



#22904



to an expert external operator while 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?



#22904



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#22904



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#22904



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22950



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22950



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



#22950



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22950



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:



#22950



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>	



#22950



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22962



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22962



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



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#22962



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:



#22962



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>	



#22962



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#22997



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#22997



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#22997



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?



#22997



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#22997



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#22997



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,

Thanks for the opportunity to provide a feedback on the proposed Long-Term Plan



#22998



(10-Year Budget).

I understand the reasons for the rate hikes but I believe that the Auckland Council has wasted and is still wasting too much money on vanity projects that have negligible value to the community. I believe that raising rates would encourage Council to continue wasting money rather than focusing on the CORE services it should provide. I do not agree with any spending, including exorbitant salaries on staff that is outside the scope of making the city function. We are officially in the recession and therefore the focus should be on spending cuts, not on milking the residents. Therefore, I reject all three options for rate hikes, especially the one that would lead to a 38% increase over three years. I only agree to inflation adjusted rates increases.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation.

Please cut back office and wasteful



#22998



spending and reprioritise money away from costly or not absolutely necessary projects, especially please stop with costly anti-car campaign and focus on fixing roads.

I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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 urge you not to overlook other submissions made with their help.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Margarita Onishchenko

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,



#22998



Thanks for the opportunity to provide a feedback on the proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I understand the reasons for the rate hikes but I believe that the Auckland Council has wasted and is still wasting too much money on vanity projects that have negligible value to the community. I believe that raising rates would encourage Council to continue wasting money rather than focusing on the CORE services it should provide. I do not agree with any spending, including exorbitant salaries on staff that is outside the scope of making the city function. We are officially in the recession and therefore the focus should be on spending cuts, not on milking the residents. Therefore, I reject all three options for rate hikes, especially the one that would lead to a 38% increase over three years. I only agree to inflation adjusted rates increases.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation.



#22998



Please cut back office and wasteful spending and reprioritise money away from costly or not absolutely necessary projects, especially please stop with costly anti-car campaign and focus on fixing roads.

I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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 urge you not to overlook other submissions made with their help.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,

Margarita Onishchenko

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#22998



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#22998



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#22998



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?



#22998



8. Do you have any other comments?



#23000



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23000



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23000



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



#23000



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#23000



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:



#23000



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>	



#23000



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23021



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23021



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#23021



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?



#23021



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#23021



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#23021



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#23030



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23030



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23030



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



#23030



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#23030



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:



#23030



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>	



#23030



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23032



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23032



- 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,



#23032



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



#23032



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#23032



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#23032



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#23032



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?



#23032



8. Do you have any other comments?



#23064



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23064



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



#23064



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#23064



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



#23064



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#23064



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?



#23064



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#23064



<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>	



#23064



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#23094



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#23094



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



#23094



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



#23094



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-



#23094



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23094



while 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



#23094



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#23094



<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>	



#23094



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23100



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



#23100



cutting back office 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



#23100



and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#23100



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 –



#23100



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23100



higher 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



#23100



operator while 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:



#23100



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#23100



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>	



#23100



increased investment in paths in the Franklin 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23113



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23113



- 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,



#23113



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



#23113



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!’



#23113



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#23113



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 residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	



#23113



<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?



#23113



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23176



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23176



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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.



#23176



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?



#23176



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:



#23176



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#23176



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23191



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.



#23191



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23191



operator while 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



#23191



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23191



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



#23191



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:



#23191



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>	



#23191



<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?



#23191



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23284



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



#23284



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.



#23284



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#23284



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



#23284



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23284



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#23284



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



#23284



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#23284



<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>	



#23284



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23289



(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.



#23289



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23289



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



#23289



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23289



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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?



#23289



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#23289



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#23289



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23412



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23412



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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.



#23412



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?



#23412



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:



#23412



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#23412



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#23418



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



#23418



on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23418



infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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).



#23418



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#23418



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23418



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



#23418



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#23418



<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>	



#23418



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#23456



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



#23456



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



#23456



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-



#23456



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23456



while 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



#23456



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#23456



<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>	



#23456



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23463



(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.



#23463



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23463



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



#23463



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23463



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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?



#23463



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#23463



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#23463



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23511



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



#23511



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#23511



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



#23511



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#23511



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?



#23511



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#23511



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#23511



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23699



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



#23699



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23699



“traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment.

I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money



#23699



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



#23699



limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#23699



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23699



core council services
such as effective waste
management, public
bins, and weekly rubbish
collection.

I also call on the Council
to get smarter about
infrastructure investment.

I support the Mayor's
proposed "Future Fund"
and the proposal to
lease Auckland Port's
operations to an expert
external operator while
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,



#23699



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:



#23699



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>	



#23699



<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?



#23699



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23708



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23708



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



#23708



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#23708



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:



#23708



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>	



#23708



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#23757



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



#23757



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23757



investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#23757



over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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-



#23757



essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23757



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



#23757



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#23757



<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>	



#23757



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#23782



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



#23782



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#23782



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



#23782



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#23782



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?



#23782



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#23782



<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>	



#23782



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23896



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23896



- 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,



#23896



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



#23896



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!’



#23896



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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?



#23896



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 residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	



#23896



<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?



#23896



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#23969



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.



#23969



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#23969



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 –



#23969



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#23969



maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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:



#23969



2a. Is there anything you 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?



#23969



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#23969



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#23988



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#23988



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



#23988



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#23988



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:



#23988



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>	



#23988



<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?



#24059



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24059



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



#24059



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#24059



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



#24059



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#24059



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?



#24059



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24059



<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>	



#24059



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24076



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#24076



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



#24076



roles until an independent review has 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.



#24076



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.



#24076



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#24076



rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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?



#24076



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?



#24076



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>	



#24076



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24081



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24081



- 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,



#24081



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



#24081



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#24081



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#24081



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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</p>	



#24081



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?



#24081



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24087



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#24087



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



#24087



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



#24087



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-



#24087



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#24087



while 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



#24087



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#24087



<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>	



#24087



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24091



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



#24091



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#24091



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



#24091



money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#24091



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:



#24091



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#24091



<p>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>	
<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,</p>	



#24091



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#24143



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.

It should ensure future housing is not in flood prone areas and to stop giving consents to developers who continue this practice

- Focus on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

Use rate payers money to upgrade and replace Aucklands broken and worn out drainage infrastructure

to stop investing in more roads



#24143



and provide alternative ways of travel, reducing trucks and cars and air pollution

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.

It should ensure future housing is not in flood prone areas and to stop giving consents to developers who continue this practice



#24143



- Focus on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

Use rate payers money to upgrade and replace Aucklands broken and worn out drainage infrastructure

to stop investing in more roads and provide alternative ways of travel, reducing trucks and cars and air pollution

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



#24143



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?



#24143



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>	



#24143



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24179



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



#24179



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#24179



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



#24179



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?

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?



#24179



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24179



<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>	



#24179



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24185



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24185



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



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#24185



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:



#24185



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>	



#24185



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24198



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



#24198



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#24198



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



#24198



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#24198



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?



#24198



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24198



<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>	



#24198



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24244



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24244



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!’



#24244



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



#24244



to an expert external operator while 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?



#24244



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24244



<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>	



#24244



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24315



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



#24315



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#24315



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



#24315



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#24315



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?



#24315



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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.	
--	--



#24315



<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>	



#24315



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24321



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment. For example hiring

Contractors to mow the lawns of green spaces that are already short. Grass in these green spaces should be allowed to grow longer to save money, increase oxygen levels and help insects and birds.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#24321



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.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment. For example hiring

Contractors to mow the lawns of green spaces that are already short. Grass in these green spaces should be allowed to grow longer to save money,

increase oxygen levels and help insects and birds.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#24321



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#24321



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#24321



<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>	



#24321



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24359



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24359



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#24359



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?



#24359



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#24359



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#24359



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24399



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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 do not support the Mayor’s proposed “Future Fund” as



#24399



the logic of in effect borrowing money to hold assets where the imputation credits are wasted is in fact insane, and that applies just as much to retaining the AIA shares

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.



#24399



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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” as

the logic of in effect borrowing money to hold assets where the imputation credits are wasted is in fact insane, and that applies

just as much to retaining the AIA shares

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?



#24399



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?



#24399



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>	



#24399



<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?



#24405



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24405



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!’



#24405



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



#24405



to an expert external operator while 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?



#24405



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24405



<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>	



#24405



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24454



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24454



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24454



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



#24454



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#24454



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:



#24454



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>	



#24454



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24457



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 reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#24457



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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.

IT IS A CRIME TO WASTE RATE PAYERS MONEY! PLEASE JUSTIFY YOUR SPENDING.

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



#24457



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 reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#24457



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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.

IT IS A CRIME TO WASTE RATE PAYERS MONEY! PLEASE JUSTIFY YOUR SPENDING.

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?



#24457



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:



#24457



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#24457



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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?



#24460



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#24460



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.



#24460



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#24460



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 –



#24460



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#24460



transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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:



#24460



2a. Is there anything you 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?



#24460



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#24460



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24529



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.

- Limit support in cultural events. At the moment essential services are more important than funding events that celebrate diversity. Leave that to the

cultural communities themselves.

- Limit any/all costs that ensure 'cultural representation and governance.' Employ the people best for the critical job, not on religious, cultural or 'birth'

rights.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



#24529



- Cut your cloth to fit. This might mean leaving some of the critical workers and trimming the fat from the executive level of staffing. One of their salaries would pay for 2-3 staff to keep our essential services going.

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



#24529



managers increasing much higher 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.

- Limit support in cultural events. At the moment essential services are more important than funding events that celebrate diversity. Leave that to the

cultural communities themselves.

- Limit any/all costs that ensure 'cultural representation and governance.' Employ the people best for the critical job, not on religious, cultural or 'birth'

rights.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

- Cut your cloth to fit. This might mean leaving some of the critical workers and trimming the fat from the executive level of staffing. One of their salaries

would pay for 2-3 staff to keep our essential services going.

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?



#24529



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24529



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>	



#24529



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?



#24534



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24534



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!'



#24534



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



#24534



to an expert external operator while 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?



#24534



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24534



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#24534



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24538



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#24538



higher 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?



#24538



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:



#24538



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#24538



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:



#24538



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	



#24538



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24538



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24600



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#24600



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



#24600



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#24600



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



#24600



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#24600



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?



#24600



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24600



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#24600



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24605



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24605



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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!’



#24605



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



#24605



to an expert external operator while 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?



#24605



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#24605



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#24605



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24679

Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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 you because I live in Glen

Innes and I have heard that the ponies are

being kicked off the Pt. ENGLAND



#24679



Reserve. Many, many locals walk along the Kiano Place pathway and love having the ponies there so much. The people who have the ponies keep the land so tidy and have done so many good things whilst they have been there. They have re built and replaced broken fencing and lots of pasture work to keep it healthy. They also do quite a lot with the community and the homeless. One of the ladies runs Island Child Charitable Trust and the other lady works with special needs kids.

This is a fabulous green space. A little bit of country in the city and give us in the community so much joy. What do we need to do to help them keep the ponies there. I would stand there and get 1000s of local signatures if I had to. Please hear our pleas.

Regards,
Sharon Budge.

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 you because I live in Glen



#24679



Innes and I have heard that the ponies are being kicked off the Pt. ENGLAND Reserve. Many, many locals walk along the Kiano Place pathway and love having the ponies there so much. The people who have the ponies keep the land so tidy and have done so many good things whilst they have been there. They have re built and replaced broken fencing and lots of pasture work to keep it healthy. They also do quite a lot with the community and the homeless. One of the ladies runs Island Child Charitable Trust and the other lady works with special needs kids.

This is a fabulous green space. A little bit of country in the city and give us in the community so much joy. What do we need to do to help them keep the ponies there. I would stand there and get 1000s of local signatures if I had to. Please hear our pleas.

Regards,
Sharon Budge.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#24679



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#24679



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24679



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?



#24679



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24688



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#24688



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:



#24688



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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!'



#24688



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



#24688



inflation by cutting back office 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



#24688



external operator while 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



#24688



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#24688



<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>	



#24688



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24695



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24695



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



#24695



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#24695



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:



#24695



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>	



#24695



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24751



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24751



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



#24751



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#24751



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:



#24751



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>	



#24751



<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?



#24905



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24905



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#24905



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



#24905



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#24905



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:



#24905



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>	



#24905



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#24961



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#24961



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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.



#24961



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?



#24961



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:



#24961



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#24961



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25106



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#25106



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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.



#25106



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?



#25106



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:



#25106



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#25106



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25142



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



#25142



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.



#25142



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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



#25142



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



#25142



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#25142



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#25142



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



#25142



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#25142



<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>	



#25142



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25144



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



#25144



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#25144



“traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment.

I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money



#25144



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



#25144



limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#25144



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#25144



core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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,



#25144



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:



#25144



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>	



#25144



<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?



#25144



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25225



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25225



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



#25225



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25225



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:



#25225



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>	



#25225



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25227



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



#25227



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



#25227



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-



#25227



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#25227



while 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



#25227



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#25227



<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>	



#25227



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25302



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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”



#25302



(such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to 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,

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



#25302



despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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'



#25302



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:



#25302



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>	



#25302



<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?



#25302



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25327



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25327



- 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,



#25327



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



#25327



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#25327



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#25327



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25327



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?



#25327



8. Do you have any other comments?



#25468



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25468



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25468



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



#25468



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25468



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:



#25468



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>	



#25468



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25479



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25479



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



#25479



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25479



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:



#25479



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>	



#25479



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25498



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25498



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



#25498



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25498



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:



#25498



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>	



#25498



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25510



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25510



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



#25510



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25510



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:



#25510



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>	



#25510



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25597



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25597



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



#25597



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25597



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:



#25597



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>	



#25597



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#25612



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:



#25612



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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?



#25612



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.



#25612



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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!'



#25612



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#25612



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>	



#25612



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25612



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#25662



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



#25662



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



#25662



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-



#25662



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#25662



while 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



#25662



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#25662



<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>	



#25662



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25668



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#25668



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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).



#25668



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#25668



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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?



#25668



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:



#25668



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#25668



We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25701



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25701



- 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,



#25701



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



#25701



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#25701



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#25701



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25701



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?



#25701



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25707



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25707



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



#25707



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25707



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:



#25707



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>	



#25707



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25708



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25708



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



#25708



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25708



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:



#25708



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>	



#25708



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25724



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25724



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



#25724



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25724



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:



#25724



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>	



#25724



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25784



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25784



- 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,



#25784



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



#25784



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#25784



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#25784



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25784



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?



#25784



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25836



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25836



- 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,



#25836



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



#25836



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#25836



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#25836



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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</p>	



#25836



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?



#25836



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25878



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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 undertake a serious and comprehensive review of infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund”.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25878



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.



#25878



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to undertake a serious and comprehensive review of infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund".

I 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:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#25878



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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



#25878

<p>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>	
<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,</p>	



#25878



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#25886



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#25886



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



#25886



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#25886



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:



#25886



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>	



#25886



<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?



#25908



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#25908



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:



#25908



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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!'



#25908



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



#25908



inflation by cutting back office 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



#25908



external operator while 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



#25908



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#25908



<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>	



#25908



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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,



#25913



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 want to see redundantly at +\$100k salary levels. Not the \$30k frontline council like many businesses in2024.



#25913



-preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting +\$100k salary packages 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 to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- hiring freeze on all council roles.like many businesses in 2024.
- pay increase freeze the reality of business in 2024.
- money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



#25913



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

Move the port and lease/ investment in
entertainment venue at the waterfront

I also call on the Council to get smarter
about infrastructure investment. I support the
Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the
proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations
to an expert external operator while 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!'



#25913



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.



#25913



I want to see redundantly at +\$100k salary levels. Not the \$30k frontline council like many businesses in 2024.

-preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting +\$100k salary packages 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 to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- hiring freeze on all council roles like many businesses in 2024.

- pay increase freeze the reality of business in 2024.



#25913



- money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

Move the port and lease/ investment in entertainment venue at the waterfront

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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?



#25913



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#25913



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25913



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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



#25934



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



#25934



salaries of council managers increasing much higher 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!’



#25934



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



#25934



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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.



#25934



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?



#25934



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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>	
---	--



#25934



<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>	



#25934



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#26039



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#26039



- 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,



#26039



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



#26039



council managers increasing much higher 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?



#26039



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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



#26039



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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</p>	



#26039



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?



#26039



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#26161



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



#26161



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



#26161



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-



#26161



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#26161



while 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



#26161



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a 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?



#26161



<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>	



#26161



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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).



#26170



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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.



#26170



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



#26170



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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)?



#26170



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:



#26170



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>	



#26170



<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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (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-



#26222



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.



#26222



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has 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



#26222



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 –



#26222



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office 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



#26222



transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while 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:



#26222



2a. Is there anything you 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?



#26222



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26222



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses 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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26263



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26263



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26263



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.



#26263



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.



#26263



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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-



#26265



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?



#26265



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#26265



reduce the need to 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?



#26265



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.



#26265



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



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26283



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26283



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26283



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.



#26283



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.



#26283



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26299



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26299



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26299



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.



#26299



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.



#26299



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26307



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26307



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26307



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.



#26307



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.



#26307



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26319



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26319



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26319



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.



#26319



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.



#26319



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26323



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26323



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26323



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.



#26323



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.



#26323



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: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26341



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26341



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26341



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.



#26341



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.



#26341



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): Kohimarama Tennis Club

Local Board: Maungakiekie-Tāmaki

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?



#26410



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you 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:



#26410



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden 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>	



#26410



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?

We are 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.



#26410



We submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

We submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

We submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

We support the following aspects of the consultation:

•

We 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.

•

We propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.

•

We 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.

•

We advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.

•

We support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.

•

We support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.

•

We 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.

