



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

Written Feedback

Local Board Not Supplied Volume #10

April 2024



Sub #	Organisation Name	Page Number
-------	-------------------	-------------

Individual submissions only



#24499



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24499



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24499



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24499



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:



#24499



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24499



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:



#24499



4c. If the 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	



#24499



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



#24499



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24502



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24502



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24502



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24502



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24502



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24502



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

Tell us 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>	



#24502



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24505



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24505



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24505



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



#24505



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24505



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24505



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24505



<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?



#24520



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24520



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24520



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24520



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24520



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24520



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24520



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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	



#24520



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?



#24520



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24521



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24521



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24521



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24521



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24521



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24521



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.	



#24521



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



#24521



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24524



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24524



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



#24524



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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:

4c. If the 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:



#24524



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24524



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24526



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease

Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24526



Having been a councillor on a NZ LOCAL Council,my first meeting included approval of the Rate Increase required for the first year. A6,5% increase

was required. I moved a motion to not pass that increase and to send the working group back to review. They came back at the specail meeting called

for 3 days later and had reduced the rates increase to 2.5% which included all the money for the outstanding jobs they wanted do .I had a similar

experence with a Power Company that I was a Director on. A new business we had invested in were short about several hundred thousand. Back to

the draft request and a review of every cost. The several hundred thousand of cost increases was found and reduced.by 80%.NZ is having these

problwms by being to soft and having fewer employees.

I dont support the leasing of the Port. Good managers and a strong financial review would keep the buiness in the Council

I would be happy to meet Mr Brown and show him how his job could be improved.
????????

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.



#24526



Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease

Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

Having been a councillor on a NZ LOCAL Council, my first meeting included approval of the Rate Increase required for the first year. A 6.5% increase

was required. I moved a motion to not pass that increase and to send the working group back to review. They came back at the special meeting called

for 3 days later and had reduced the rates increase to 2.5% which included all the money for the outstanding jobs they wanted do. I had a similar



#24526



experience with a Power Company that I was a Director on. A new business we had invested in were short about several hundred thousand. Back to

the draft request and a review of every cost. The several hundred thousand of cost increases was found and reduced by 80%. NZ is having these

problems by being too soft and having fewer employees.

I don't support the leasing of the Port. Good managers and a strong financial review would keep the business in the Council

I would be happy to meet Mr Brown and show him how his job could be improved.
????????

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



#24526



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?



#24526



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



#24526



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24527



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24527



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24527



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24527



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24527



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24527



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.	



#24527



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



#24527



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24531



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24531



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24531



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24531



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24531



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24531



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

Tell us 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>	



#24531



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24532



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24532



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



#24532



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24532



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24532



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24532



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24533



Year Budget).

Firstly, TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE
Auckland needs a LONG TERM - 40yr
plan for motorways/roading within, around
and out of the city to service ALL
residential developments - especially on
the rural outskirts of Auckland City to the
South.

It is irresponsible of Auckland City planning
to continue approving residential
developments where there is
INADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION
INFRASTRUCTURE eg. "FORTLANDS".

The WEYMOUTH BRIDGE MOTORWAY
OPTION is critical to the watershed area
to the South West of Auckland and links to
SH1. South West Auckland is being
rapidly developed with only one choked
link (exit 458) to the Southern Motorway.

(A 10 minute trip just to get on SH1 took
1hr 10minutes on Tuesday morning at
8:45am with traffic crawling the entire
length of Hingaia - Linwood Road from Exit



#24533



468 west to Laing Road.)

I reject all three options for rate hikes.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing.

Intelligently solve the Transportation Infrastructure overall design (currently there is a lack of a comprehensive futureproof design) this must be done in consultation with the Ministry of Transport with the application of Basic Urban Design Principles to the whole of the Auckland City & Region.

Perhaps it is time to have a Government



#24533



Commission & Commissioner with powers to get Auckland & it's Regional Transportation and other infrastructure demands identified and project managed to completion. Preferably before the city comes to a grinding halt...currently the city certainly underwhelmingly limps along every day as evidenced by the ever increasing daily traffic pile ups on the motorway.

Yours sincerely

Angela Horn

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).

Firstly, TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE



#24533



Auckland needs a LONG TERM - 40yr plan for motorways/roading within, around and out of the city to service ALL residential developments - especially on the rural outskirts of Auckland City to the South.

It is irresponsible of Auckland City planning to continue approving residential developments where there is INADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE eg. "FORTLANDS".

The WEYMOUTH BRIDGE MOTORWAY OPTION is critical to the watershed area to the South West of Auckland and links to SH1. South West Auckland is being rapidly developed with only one choked link (exit 458) to the Southern Motorway.

(A 10 minute trip just to get on SH1 took 1hr 10minutes on Tuesday morning at 8:45am with traffic crawling the entire length of Hingaia - Linwood Road from Exit 468 west to Laing Road.)

I reject all three options for rate hikes.



#24533



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing.

Intelligently solve the Transportation Infrastructure overall design (currently there is a lack of a comprehensive futureproof design) this must be done in consultation with the Ministry of Transport with the application of Basic Urban Design Principles to the whole of the Auckland City & Region.

Perhaps it is time to have a Government Commission & Commissioner with powers to get Auckland & it's Regional Transportation and other infrastructure



#24533



demands identified and project managed to completion. Preferably before the city comes to a grinding halt...currently the city certainly underwhelmingly limps along every day as evidenced by the ever increasing daily traffic pile ups on the motorway.

Yours sincerely

Angela Horn

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:



#24533



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



#24533



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24533



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24537



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24537



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



#24537



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24537



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24537



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24537



<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?



#24540



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24540



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24540



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.p
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24540



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24540



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24540



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.p

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



#24540



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:



#24540



4c. If the 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>	



#24540



<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?



#24540



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24542



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24542



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24542



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24542



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24542



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24542



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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	



#24542



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?



#24542



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24545



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24545



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24545



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24545



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24545



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



#24545



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:



#24545



4c. If the 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>	



#24545



<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?



#24545



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24552



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24552



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24552



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:



#24552



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24552



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:



#24552



4c. If the 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	



#24552



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



#24552



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24553



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment. No more nice to

haves, like cycleways, until basic infrastructure is repaired and upgraded to meet future demand.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease



#24553



Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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. No more nice to

have, like cycleways, until basic infrastructure is repaired and upgraded to meet future demand.



#24553



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease

Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24553



Tell us why:

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



#24553



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>	



#24553



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24554



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24554



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24554



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24554



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24554



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24554



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



#24554



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:



#24554



4c. If the 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>	



#24554



<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?



#24554



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24558



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,



#24558



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#24558



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24558



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.



#24558



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24558



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24558



4c. If the 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>	



#24558



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



#24558



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24560



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24560



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#24560



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#24560



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-



#24560



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#24560



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24560



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?



#24560



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



#24560



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24563



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24563



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24563



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24563



should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24563



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24563



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?



#24563



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

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#24563



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



#24563



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24565



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



#24565



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24565



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



#24565



'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:



#24565



4c. If the 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	



#24565



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



#24565



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24567



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24567



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



#24567



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24567



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24567



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24567



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24569



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24569



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



#24569



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24569



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24569



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24569



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24571



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24571



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's



#24571



operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ring fencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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

Auckland Council should focus on the core services for the people paying rates. This does not include frivolous support to external commercial ventures. Hard financial times means Auckland Council needs to shed people at the mid and top level.

Auckland Council/ Auckland Transport hierarchy have no right to feel proud of how they have financially crippled the community with wasteful spending.



#24571



The amalgamation of 5 councils did not end up with saving costs.

Shame on you and your predecessors.

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



#24571



labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be



#24571



used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ring fencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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

Auckland Council should focus on the core services for the people



#24571



paying rates. This does not include frivolous support to external commercial ventures. Hard financial times means Auckland Council needs to shed people at the mid and top level.

Auckland Council/ Auckland Transport hierarchy have no right to feel proud of how they have financially crippled the community with wasteful spending.

The amalgamation of 5 councils did not end up with saving costs.

Shame on you and your predecessors.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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



#24571



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

Tell us why:

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



#24571



Tell us 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>	



#24571



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24572



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24572



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



#24572



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24572



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24572



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24572



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24575



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24575



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24575



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24575



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24575



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



#24575



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:



#24575



4c. If the 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>	



#24575



<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?



#24575



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24576



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24576



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24576



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:



#24576



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24576



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:



#24576



4c. If the 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	



#24576



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



#24576



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24578



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24578



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24578



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



#24578



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24578



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?



#24578



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24578



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

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



#24578



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24579



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24579



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24579



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



#24579



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24579



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24579



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

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



#24579



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24580



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24580



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24580



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24580



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



#24580



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24580



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24580



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



#24580



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24580



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24581



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24581



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



#24581



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24581



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24581



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24581



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24585



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24585



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



#24585



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24585



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24585



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24585



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24587



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24587



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24587



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



#24587



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24587



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24587



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



#24587



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24587



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24588



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24588



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24588



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24588



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24588



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24588



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24588



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us 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>	



#24588



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?



#24588



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,



#24591



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#24591



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24591



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.



#24591



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24591



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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)?



#24591



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24591



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24591



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24593



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24593



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24593



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24593



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24593



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24593



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell 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	



#24593



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?



#24593



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24596



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24596



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



#24596



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24596



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24596



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24596



<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?



#24598



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24598



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24598



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24598



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24598



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24598



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24598



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

Tell us 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>	



#24598



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24599



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24599



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



#24599



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24599



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24599



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24599



<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?



#24602



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24602



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24602



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24602



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24602



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24602



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24602



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.	



#24602



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



#24602



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24606



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24606



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24606



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24606



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24606



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24606



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



#24606



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:



#24606



4c. If the 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	



#24606



<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?



#24606



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24607



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24607



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24607



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



#24607



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24607



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24607



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24607



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24610



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24610



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24610



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



#24610



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24610



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?



#24610



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24610



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



#24610



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24613



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24613



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



#24613



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24613



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24613



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24613



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

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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24616



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24616



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#24616



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24616



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



#24616



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24616



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#24616



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#24616



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?



#24616



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



#24616



<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?



#24620



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24620



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24620



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24620



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24620



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24620



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24620



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

Tell us 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>	



#24620



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24621



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24621



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24621



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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

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



#24621



circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24621



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and



#24621



back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'
Frank Waitai

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24621



Tell us 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	



#24621



<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>	



#24621



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24622



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should
be limited to inflation and
the Council should cut its
cloth to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland
ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it
being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less”
option.

I strongly urge Councillors
to explore ways of
preventing rates increases



#24622



over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This



#24622



money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24622



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.



#24622



Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address



#24622



concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by

Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund”



#24622



and the proposal to lease
Auckland Port's operations
to an expert external
operator while keeping the
Port's land in ratepayers'
hands and ringfencing that
money to invest in
infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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?



#24622



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

Tell us why:

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



#24622



Tell us 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>	



#24622



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24623



All I ever see or hear about now is bureaucracies, and if the CEO did go on a hiring spree, I reject that also. It's never ending. Do you really think you can

do this, and your own children and grandchildren will have a future. If they don't they'll know who to blame.

I thought Wayne Brown was the 'tough guy' so who's running the 'joint'

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay

less, get less” option.

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

Thanks

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).

All I ever see or hear about now is bureaucracies, and if the CEO did go on a hiring spree, I reject that also. It's never ending. Do you really think you can

do this, and your own children and grandchildren will have a future. If they don't they'll know who to blame.

I thought Wayne Brown was the 'tough guy' so who's running the 'joint'



#24623



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

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

Thanks

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:



#24623



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



#24623



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24623



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24624



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24624



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24624



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



#24624



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24624



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24624



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



#24624



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24625



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24625



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24625



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



#24625



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24625



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



#24625



Tell us 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	



#24625



<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>	



#24625



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24627



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24627



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



#24627



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24627



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24627



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24627



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24628



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24628



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24628



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:



#24628



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24628



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:



#24628



4c. If the 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>	



#24628



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



#24628



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24631



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over

three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the

current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than

inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by

cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and

reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address

concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the

private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures”

(such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads

and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and



#24631



weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external

operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24631



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by

cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and

reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address

concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the

private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures”

(such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads

and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and

weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external

operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24631



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



#24631



Tell us 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 we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	



#24631



<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>	



#24631



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24634



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24634



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24634



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24634



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



#24634



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24634



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?



#24634



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24634



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

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



#24634



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24636



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24636



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24636



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:



#24636



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24636



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:



#24636



4c. If the 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	



#24636



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



#24636



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24638



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24638



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24638



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24638



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24638



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

Tell us 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>	



#24638



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24642



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24642



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



#24642



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24642



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24642



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24642



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24647



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24647



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24647



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



#24647



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24647



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?



#24647



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24647



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

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



#24647



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24648



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24648



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24648



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24648



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



#24648



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24648



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?



#24648



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24648



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



#24648



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24653



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24653



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

The council is a beast out of control eating all Aucklander home owners of their hard earned money with very little to show for it

We do not need to give you any more money you need to manage the money you have got better . If you want the city to be full of disgruntled residents you are going about it the right way



#24653



For the sake of the next generation . Stop and think of how you are destroying our younger generations hope and future

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”



#24653



option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about



#24653



infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

The council is a beast out of control eating all Aucklander home owners of their hard earned money with very little to show for it

We do not need to give you any more money you need to manage the money you have got better . If you want the city to be full of disgruntled residents you are going about it the right way

For the sake of the next ge station . Stop and think of how you are destroying our younger generations hope and future

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?



#24653



Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24653



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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us 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>	



#24653



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24654



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24654



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#24654



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get



#24654



smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24654



hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24654



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24654



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24654



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



#24654



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24654



<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?



#24656



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24656



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential



#24656



roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24656



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.



#24656



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly



#24656



rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24656



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

Tell us why:

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



#24656



Tell us 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>	



#24656



<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?



#24659



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24659



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24659



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24659



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



#24659



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24659



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24659



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



#24659



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24659



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24660



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24660



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24660



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24660



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



#24660



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24660



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?



#24660



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24660



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



#24660



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24662



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24662



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24662



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24662



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24662



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24662



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

Tell us 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>	



#24662



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24663



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24663



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)?



#24663



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24663



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24663



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24665



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



#24665



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24665



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



#24665



'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:



#24665



4c. If the 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>	



#24665



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



#24665



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24667



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#24667



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#24667



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-



#24667



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#24667



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24667



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?



#24667



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



#24667



<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?



#24670



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24670



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24670



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24670



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24670



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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24670



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

Tell us 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>	



#24670



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24671



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24671



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)?



#24671



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24671



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24671



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24672



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24672



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



#24672



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24672



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24672



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24672



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24677



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24677



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24677



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



#24677



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24677



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?



#24677



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

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24677



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



#24677



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24681



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24681



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



#24681



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24681



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24681



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24681



<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?



#24686



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24686



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24686



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#24686



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24686



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



#24686



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24686



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#24686



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#24686



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?



#24686



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



#24686



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24693



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



#24693



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24693



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



#24693



'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:



#24693



4c. If the 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	



#24693



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



#24693



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24697



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24697



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



#24697



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24697



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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:



#24697



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24697



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24700



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24700



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's



#24700



operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24700



current economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those



#24700



the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the



#24700



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



#24700



Tell us 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	



#24700



<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>	



#24700



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24701



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24701



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24701



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24701



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24701



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24701



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.	



#24701



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



#24701



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24703



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24703



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24703



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:



#24703



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24703



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:



#24703



4c. If the 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>	



#24703



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



#24703



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24704



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,



#24704



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#24704



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24704



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.



#24704



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24704



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

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

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

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

Tell us why:

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



#24704



4c. If the 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>	



#24704



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



#24704



Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24707



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#24707



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get



#24707



smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24707



hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24707



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24707



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24707



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



#24707



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#24707



<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?



#24708



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24708



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24708



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24708



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24708



should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24708



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24708



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?



#24708



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

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#24708



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

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



#24708



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

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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24710



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24710



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#24710



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24710



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



#24710



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24710



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#24710



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#24710



Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us 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?



#24710



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



#24710



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24714



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24714



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#24714



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



#24714



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24714



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



#24714



Tell us 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	



#24714



<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>	



#24714



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

Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

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

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

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

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

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24716



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24716



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24716



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24716



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

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24716



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24716



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24717



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24717



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24717



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:



#24717



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24717



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:



#24717



4c. If the 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



#24717



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24717



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24718



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth to
reflect the current economic
circumstances facing
Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24718



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core



#24718



council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#24718



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.



#24718



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed



#24718



humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of



#24718



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?



#24718



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#24718



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24718



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24719



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24719



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24719



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24719



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24719



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24719



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24719



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?



#24719



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24720



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24720



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#24720



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24720



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



#24720



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24720



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#24720



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#24720



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#24720



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24720



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24724



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24724



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24724



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



#24724



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24724



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?



#24724



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#24724



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24724



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24725



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24725



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



#24725



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24725



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24725



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24725



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24729



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24729



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24729



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24729



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24729



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24729



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.	



#24729



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#24729



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24732



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24732



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24732



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24732



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24732



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24732



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24733



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24733



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24733



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24733



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24733



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24733



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24734



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24734



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24734



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:



#24734



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24734



4c. If the 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>	



#24734



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24734



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24739



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24739



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



#24739



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24739



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24739



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24739



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24742



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24742



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’

Stop wasting our fuckin money.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,



#24742



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the



#24742



private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

Stop wasting our fuckin money.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#24742



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24742



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24742



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?



#24742



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24746



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

- Get rid of the preferred contractor system and create more accountability, too many jobs paid out on but not done

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease



#24746



Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the

“pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council



#24746



managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

- Get rid of the preferred contractor system and create more accountability, too many jobs paid out on but not done

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease

Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24746



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24746



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>	



#24746



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24759



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24759



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



#24759



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24759



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24759



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24759



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24760



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24760



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24760



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24760



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24760



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24760



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24760



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24763



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24763



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24763



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



#24763



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24763



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?



#24763



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24763



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24763



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24765



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#24765



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



#24765



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24765



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24765



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure



#24765



investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24765



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24765



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>	



#24765



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24770



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and



#24770



reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish



#24770



collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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-



#24770



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and



#24770



reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish



#24770



collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24770



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24770



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24770



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24774



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24774



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24774



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24774



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24774



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24774



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24774



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?



#24774



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24776



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24776



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



#24776



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24776



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24776



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24776



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24777



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.



#24777



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24777



wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing

and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24777



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24777



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24777



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24779



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24779



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



#24779



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24779



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24779



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24779



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24782



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24782



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24782



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



#24782



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24782



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?



#24782



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24782



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24782



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24786



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24786



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24786



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



#24786



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24786



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?



#24786



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24786



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24786



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24787



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24787



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24787



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24787



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24787



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24787



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24787



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24788



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24788



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#24788



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24788



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



#24788



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24788



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#24788



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#24788



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#24788



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24788



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24796



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24796



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



#24796



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24796



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24796



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24796



<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?



#24804



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24804



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#24804



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#24804



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-



#24804



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#24804



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24804



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#24804



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24804



<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?



#24805



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24805



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24805



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24805



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:



#24805



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24805



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:



#24805



4c. If the 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	



#24805



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24805



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24807



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24807



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24807



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



#24807



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24807



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24807



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24807



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24810



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24810



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



#24810



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24810



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24810



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24810



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24811



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24811



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24811



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24811



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24811



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24811



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24811



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?



#24811



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#24813



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled



#24813



Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



#24813



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24813



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24813



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24813



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24813



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24813



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24813



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24814



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24814



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24814



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24814



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24814



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24814



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.	



#24814



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#24814



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24818



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24818



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



#24818



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24818



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24818



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24818



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24821



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24821



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24821



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



#24821



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24821



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?



#24821



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24821



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24821



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24825



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24825



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24825



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



#24825



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24825



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24825



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24825



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24825



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24826



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#24826



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#24826



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24826



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



#24826



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24826



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#24826



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#24826



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#24826



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24826



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24827



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24827



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



#24827



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24827



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24827



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24827



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24828



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I do not support the Auckland Future Fund. It will not reduce costs and will not provide the benefits the mayor suggests.



#24828



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.



#24828



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I do not support the Auckland Future Fund. It will not reduce costs and will not provide the benefits the mayor suggests.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#24828



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#24828



<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>	



#24828



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24832



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24832



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.



#24832



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#24832



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#24832



<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>	



#24832



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#24835



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#24835



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24835



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.



#24835



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#24835



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24835



4c. If the 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	



#24835



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24835



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24839



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24839



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24839



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24839



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



#24839



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24839



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24839



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24839



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24839



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24843



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24843



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24843



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.



#24843



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:



#24843



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#24843



<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>	



#24843



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24845



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24845



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24845



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24845



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24845



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24845



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24845



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24845



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?



#24845



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24846



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24846



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24846



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



#24846



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24846



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24846



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24846



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24847



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24847



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24847



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:



#24847



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24847



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:



#24847



4c. If the 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	



#24847



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24847



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24848



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24848



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24848



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



#24848



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24848



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24848



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24848



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24856



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24856



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24856



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24856



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24856



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24856



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24865



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24865



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24865



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



#24865



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24865



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?



#24865



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24865



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24865



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24869



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24869



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24869



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



#24869



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24869



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24869



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24869



<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?



#24870



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24870



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should
be limited to inflation and
the Council should cut its
cloth to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland
ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it
being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less”
option.

I strongly urge Councillors
to explore ways of
preventing rates increases



#24870



over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#24870



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24870



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.



#24870



Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address



#24870



concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund”



#24870



and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24870



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24870



Tell us 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>	



#24870



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#24873



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24873



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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,



#24873



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24873



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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?



#24873



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24873



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24873



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24874



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24874



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24874



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24874



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24874



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24874



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24874



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?



#24874



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24875



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24875



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24875



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24875



should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24875



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24875



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?



#24875



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24875



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24875



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24877



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three

years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic

circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation

despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting

back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money

spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns

of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as

unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain

transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly

rubbish collection.



#24877



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed

“Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while

keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that

rates and debt are 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



#24877



back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money

spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns

of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as

unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain

transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly

rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed

“Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while

keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that

rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates,

Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24877



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24877



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24877



reduce the need to 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?



#24877



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24880



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#24880



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore



#24880



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain



#24880



transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#24880



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



#24880



labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24880



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and



#24880



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



#24880



Tell us 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	



#24880



<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>	



#24880



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24882



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24882



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



#24882



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24882



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24882



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24882



<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?



#24886



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24886



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24886



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



#24886



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24886



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24886



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24886



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24887



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24887



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24887



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24887



ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and



#24887



unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable



#24887



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:



#24887



4c. If the 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



#24887



<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?



#24887



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24892



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24892



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



#24892



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24892



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24892



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24892



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24893



(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24893



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#24893



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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



#24893



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#24893



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24893



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24893



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24893



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24894



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24894



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24894



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



#24894



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24894



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24894



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24894



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#24897



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#24897



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24897



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.



#24897



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24897



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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)?



#24897



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24897



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24897



<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?



#24900



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24900



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24900



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



#24900



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24900



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24900



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24900



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24901



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24901



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



#24901



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24901



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24901



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24901



<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?



#24904



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24904



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24904



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24904



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24904



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24904



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24904



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24904



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?



#24904



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24906



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24906



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24906



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



#24906



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24906



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24906



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24906



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24907



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to Express my frustration
of a rarely raised (in the media?) point



#24907



which is WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY COUNCIL OFFICER'S TO PEER REVIEW A PERSON'S HOUSE PLAN, WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN PREPARED BY QUALIFIED PEOPLE and when the Council Officer is already on wages!!! Double charging and wasted time.

This could easily be freed up (at NO cost to the applicant) by having a form for applying for a building permit which simply ticks off all requirements with copies of qualified requirements supplied and already completed by qualified engineers, builders, etc. WHY DOES COUNCIL EVEN NEED TO DO IT ALL OVER AGAIN!! It just doesn't make sense AND IT IS COSTLY.

It takes up Council Officers time and why are Council even employing people to do a job that is already professionally completed.

Other Councils in the world have the simple tick off form.

This will save money, time, and over the top frustrations. If you want to reduce staff this would be one quick



#24907



way. Those people peer reviewing could go out and set up their own business completing the housing requirements AND THERE WOULD BE NO DOUBLE CHARGING. Certainly reduces costs for everyone. Please let me know your response to this idea. Thank you.

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 Express my frustration of a rarely raised (in the media?) point which is WHY DO WE HAVE TO PAY COUNCIL OFFICER'S TO PEER REVIEW A PERSON'S HOUSE PLAN, WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN PREPARED BY QUALIFIED PEOPLE and when the Council Officer is already on wages!!! Double charging and wasted time.



#24907



This could easily be freed up (at NO cost to the applicant) by having a form for applying for a building permit which simply ticks off all requirements with copies of qualified requirements supplied and already completed by qualified engineers, builders, etc. WHY DOES COUNCIL EVEN NEED TO DO IT ALL OVER AGAIN!! It just doesn't make sense AND IT IS COSTLY.

It takes up Council Officers time and why are Council even employing people to do a job that is already professionally completed.

Other Councils in the world have the simple tick off form.

This will save money, time, and over the top frustrations. If you want to reduce staff this would be one quick way. Those people peer reviewing could go out and set up their own business completing the housing requirements AND THERE WOULD BE NO DOUBLE CHARGING.

Certainly reduces costs for everyone. Please let me know your response to this idea.



Thank you.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24907



Tell us 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	



#24907



<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>	



#24907



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24908



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24908



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24908



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



#24908



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24908



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24908



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24908



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24912



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24912



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24912



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24912



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24912



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24912



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24914



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24914



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24914



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24914



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24914



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24914



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24914



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?



#24914



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24929



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24929



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24929



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



#24929



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24929



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?



#24929



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24929



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24929



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



#24931



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24931



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and



#24931



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:



#24931



4c. If the 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>	



#24931



<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?



#24931



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24932



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24932



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



#24932



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24932



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24932



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24932



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24934



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24934



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#24934



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



#24934



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24934



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24934



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24934



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24940



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24940



(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24940



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#24940



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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



#24940



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#24940



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24940



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24940



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24940



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24942



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24942



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24942



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24942



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



#24942



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24942



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?



#24942



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24942



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24942



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24943



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24943



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24943



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24943



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#24943



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24943



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24943



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.	



#24943



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#24943



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24945



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24945



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



#24945



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24945



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24945



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24945



<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?



#24946



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24946



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24946



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24946



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24946



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24946



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24946



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24946



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24948



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24948



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24948



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24948



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24948



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other



#24948



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24948



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?



#24948



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24950



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24950



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24950



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24950



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:



#24950



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#24950



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:



#24950



4c. If the 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	



#24950



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#24950



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24954



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24954



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24954



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



#24954



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24954



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24954



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24954



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24956



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24956



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24956



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



#24956



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24956



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?



#24956



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24956



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24956



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24959



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24959



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24959



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24959



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24959



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24959



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24959



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?



#24959



8. Do you have any other comments?



#24960



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#24960



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should
be limited to inflation and
the Council should cut its
cloth to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it
being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less”
option.

I strongly urge Councillors
to explore ways of
preventing rates increases
over and above inflation by



#24960



cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads



#24960



and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their



#24960



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 –



#24960



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#24960



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#24960



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24960



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24960



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24960



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

A proposed 38% increase in our rates is not why we elected Mayor Brown.



#24963



We elected him and other Councillors to cut all the waste and return to a focus on core services. To run the Council with the efficiency of a private organisation beholden to its shareholders (the citizens of Auckland).

My brother who lives on Sydney's North Shore was horrified when I told him what I pay in rates on my home and rental properties. He has also heard from Auckland friends what their rates bill is.

He has described what we pay in Auckland as 'criminal'.

Also he just had his whole street re-tarsealed. 1/10th of the road cones were used that we would have to do the job and it took them one afternoon!!

He was amazed at the excessive use of road cones on his last visit to Auckland.

A rates increase above inflation will also mean a rise in rents so landlords can cover costs.

As an aside, I mapped my rates increase over the last 15 years and I think another word that comes to mind is "horrific".



#24963



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation BY CUTTING BACK OFFICE AND WASTEFUL SPENDING, REINING IN COUNCIL CONTROLLED ORGANISATIONS, AND REPRIORITISING MONEY SPENT ON OPERATIONS AND STAFFING TO CAPITAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an



#24963



independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24963



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,

A proposed 38% increase in our rates is not why we elected Mayor Brown.

We elected him and other Councillors to cut all the waste and return to a focus on core services. To run the Council with the efficiency of a private organisation beholden to its shareholders (the citizens of Auckland).

My brother who lives on Sydney's North Shore was horrified when I told him what I pay in rates on my home and rental properties. He has also heard from Auckland friends what their rates bill is.

He has described what we pay in Auckland as 'criminal'.

Also he just had his whole street re-tarsealed. 1/10th of the road cones were used that we would have to do the job and it took them one afternoon!!

He was amazed at the excessive use of road cones on his last visit to Auckland.



#24963



A rates increase above inflation will also mean a rise in rents so landlords can cover costs.

As an aside, I mapped my rates increase over the last 15 years and I think another word that comes to mind is "horrific".

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation BY CUTTING BACK OFFICE AND WASTEFUL SPENDING, REINING IN COUNCIL CONTROLLED ORGANISATIONS, AND



#24963



REPRIORITISING MONEY SPENT ON OPERATIONS AND STAFFING TO CAPITAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24963



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?



#24963



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24963



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24963



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24966



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24966



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24966



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



#24966



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24966



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24966



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24966



<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?



#24968



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24968



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24968



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24968



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



#24968



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24968



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?



#24968



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24968



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24968



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24969



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24969



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24969



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



#24969



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24969



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24969



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24969



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24969



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24970



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24970



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#24970



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24970



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24970



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24970



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24972



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#24972



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#24972



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24972



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24972



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#24972



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#24972



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?



#24972



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24974



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24974



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#24974



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24974



should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#24974



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24974



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?



#24974



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24974



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#24974



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24978



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#24978



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure



#24978



investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24978



over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-



#24978



essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's



#24978



land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24978



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#24978



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24978



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24982



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#24982



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



#24982



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#24982



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#24982



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24982



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#24983



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#24983



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#24983



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



#24983



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#24983



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?



#24983



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#24983



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24983



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24986



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24986



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#24986



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#24986



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-



#24986



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#24986



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#24986



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#24986



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24986



<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?



#24990



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#24990



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24990



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24990



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#24990



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24990



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24990



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24990



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24992



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#24992



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



#24992



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#24992



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24992



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure



#24992



investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#24992



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#24992



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>	



#24992



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24994



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24994



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#24994



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#24994



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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 –



#24994



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and



#24994



maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24994



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24994



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#24994



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#24998



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#24998



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#24998



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#24998



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



#24998



of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#24998



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#24998



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#24998



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#24998



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25000



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25000



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#25000



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#25000



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-



#25000



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#25000



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25000



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25000



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25000



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#25001



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#25001



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#25001



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down. Council should try to sell Golf courses which are burden to maintain and if you sell money will come in.

I endorse the submission of



#25001



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



#25001



presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25001



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#25001



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down. Council should try to sell Golf courses which are burden to maintain and if you sell money will come in.

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?



#25001



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25001



Tell us 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>	



#25001



<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?



#25002



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25002



The Council should focus on core business, including infrastructure investment in the face of climate change, while retaining assets for the ratepayers. By

this, I mean that:

- the Council should cease activities which are not part of its core business, such as the Diwali celebrations or pictures in the park

- the port should not be leased out for an extended period: the Council should set clearer goals and have better oversight of port company activities.

Roger Grey is a highly competent executive who should be required to work closely with the Council as the representative of stakeholders

- there should be urgent action for the consequences of climate change, including improved public transport (& yes, cycle lanes) while introducing congestion charging i.e. a carrot and stick approach.

There are clear gaps in infrastructure, while unfettered population growth via immigration should be opposed, given its effects on existing infrastructure and housing stock.

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).



#25002



The Council should focus on core business, including infrastructure investment in the face of climate change, while retaining assets for the ratepayers. By

this, I mean that:

- the Council should cease activities which are not part of its core business, such as the Diwali celebrations or pictures in the park

- the port should not be leased out for an extended period: the Council should set clearer goals and have better oversight of port company activities.

Roger Grey is a highly competent executive who should be required to work closely with the Council as the representative of stakeholders

- there should be urgent action for the consequences of climate change, including improved public transport (& yes, cycle lanes) while introducing congestion charging i.e. a carrot and stick approach.

There are clear gaps in infrastructure, while unfettered population growth via immigration should be opposed, given its effects on existing infrastructure and housing stock.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?



#25002



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25002



Tell us 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>	



#25002



<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?



#25003



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25003



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25003



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25003



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25003



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25003



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25003



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25003



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25005



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25005



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25005



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25005



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



#25005



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25005



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?



#25005



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25005



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25005



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25007



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25007



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25007



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

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



#25007



economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such



#25007



as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



#25007



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25007



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25007



<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?



#25008



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25008



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25008



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



#25008



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25008



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25008



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25008



<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?



#25009



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#25009



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should
be limited to inflation and
the Council should cut its
cloth to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it
being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less”
option.

I strongly urge Councillors
to explore ways of
preventing rates increases
over and above inflation by



#25009



cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads



#25009



and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their



#25009



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 –



#25009



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25009



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external



#25009



operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25009



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25009



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25009



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25010



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25010



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25010



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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 –



#25010



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and



#25010



maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25010



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25010



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25010



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25011



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25011



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25011



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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 –



#25011



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and



#25011



maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25011



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25011



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25011



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25013



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25013



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



#25013



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25013



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25013



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25013



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25014



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#25014



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#25014



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-



#25014



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#25014



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25014



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25014



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25014



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25017



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25017



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25017



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25017



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25017



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25017



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25017



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25020



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25020



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25020



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25020



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#25020



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25020



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25020



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.	



#25020



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#25020



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25021



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25021



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25021



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25021



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25021



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25021



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25021



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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). I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers. Of the three options presented, my



#25022



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option. I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment. This should include: - A hiring freeze on all non- essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector. - Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure. - Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection. In addition I call on Council to get Auckland Transport under control by cutting funding for all those speed Humps, Cycle Lanes to nowhere such as in St George St Avondale. When I see what's going on with all the pedestrian on traffic lights as is the case on Hillsborough Rd, the first thing I think of is Corruption. Let's Complete the current works before start new work Stop fixing things that are not broke, and Stop doing costly vanity work. Stick to your core business. In terms of Auckland Transport just about every event they provide public transport for they seem to stuff it up. I can give several examples, just email me at blackdouglas@xtra.co.nz. And while I am on a role why oh why do you have truck and bus lanes 12 hrs a day in places such as Gr South Rd and Puhinui Rd which are nothing more than revenue gathering. I happy to discuss that also. I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down. I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’ Lyle Drysdale blackdouglas@xtra.co.nz

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



#25022



reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment. This should include: - A hiring freeze on all non- essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector. - Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure. - Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection. In addition I call on Council to get Auckland Transport under control by cutting funding for all those speed Humps, Cycle Lanes to nowhere such as in St George St Avondale. When I see what's going on with all the pedestrian on traffic lights as is the case on Hillsborough Rd, the first thing I think of is Corruption. Let's Complete the current works before start new work Stop fixing things that are not broke, and Stop doing costly vanity work. Stick to your core business. In terms of Auckland Transport just about every event they provide public transport for they seem to stuff it up. I can give several examples, just email me at blackdouglas@xtra.co.nz. And while I am on a role why oh why do you have truck and bus lanes 12 hrs a day in places such as Gr South Rd and Puhinui Rd which are nothing more than revenue gathering. I happy to discuss that also. I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down. I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!' Lyle Drysdale blackdouglas@xtra.co.nz

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?



#25022



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25022



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>	



#25022



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25025



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25025



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25025



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



#25025



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25025



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?



#25025



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25025



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25025



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25026



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates

should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing

Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it

being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office

and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and

staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of

overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as

unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport

infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.



#25026



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund"

and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in

ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25026



and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of

overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as

unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport

infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish

collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund”

and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in

ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25026



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25026



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25026



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?



#25026



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25029



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective



#25029



waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#25029



Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers'



#25029



hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25029



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25029



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25029



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25032



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.



#25032



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#25032



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and



#25032



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:



#25032



4c. If the 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>	



#25032



<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?



#25032



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25035



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and

the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary

speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25035



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#25035



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25035



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25035



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25035



Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25037



Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25037



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's



#25037



operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25037



current economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my
preferred option is lowest option –
which is still much higher than
inflation despite it being deceptively
labelled the “pay less, get less”
option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing rates
increases over and above inflation
by cutting back office and wasteful
spending, reining in Council-
Controlled Organisations, and
reprioritising money spent on
operations and staffing to capital
and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-
essential roles until an independent
review has been taken to address
concerns of overstaffing and the
salaries of council managers
increasing much higher than those



#25037



the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the



#25037



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



#25037



Tell us 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	



#25037



<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>	



#25037



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25038



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25038



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



#25038



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25038



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25038



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25038



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25043



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25043



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25043



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25043



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



#25043



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25043



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?



#25043



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25043



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25043



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25044



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25044



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25044



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25044



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25044



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25044



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25044



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25044



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?



#25044



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25047



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25047



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25047



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#25047



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25047



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25047



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.	



#25047



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#25047



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25048



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25048



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25048



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25048



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25048



should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25048



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25048



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?



#25048



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25048



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25048



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25050



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#25050



proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending,



#25050



reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as



#25050



effective waste management,
public bins, and weekly
rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get
smarter about infrastructure
investment. I support the
Mayor's proposed "Future
Fund" and the proposal to
lease Auckland Port's
operations to an expert
external operator while
keeping the Port's land in
ratepayers' hands and
ringfencing that money to
invest in infrastructure so that
rates and debt are 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?



#25050



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



#25050



explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix



#25050



roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25050



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:



#25050



4c. If the 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>	



#25050



<p>residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#25050



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25053



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25053



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25053



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25053



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25053



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25053



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25053



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25054



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#25054



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and



#25054



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's



#25054



proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25054



expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#25054



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25054



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:



#25054



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#25054



<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>	



#25054



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25056



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25056



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25056



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#25056



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25056



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25056



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.	



#25056



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#25056



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25059



(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25059



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25059



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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



#25059



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#25059



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25059



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25059



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25059



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25061



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25061



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25061



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25061



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25061



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25061



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25061



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?



#25061



8. Do you have any other comments?



#25064



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25064



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25064



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25064



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



#25064



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25064



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?



#25064



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25064



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25064



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25065



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#25065



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#25065



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



#25065



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#25065



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25065



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25065



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25065



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25066



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25066



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25066



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



#25066



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25066



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25066



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25066



<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?



#25070



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25070



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential 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. Far too many 'Managers' being paid excessive salaries. Stop Hiring!!!!
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps and raised pedestrian crossings).. by Auckland Transport. Not necessary...pedestrians need to look and wait prior to crossing the road. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain



#25070



transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#25070



Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential 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. Far too many 'Managers' being paid excessive salaries. Stop Hiring!!!!
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps and raised pedestrian crossings).. by Auckland Transport. Not necessary...pedestrians need to look and wait prior to crossing the road. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25070



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25070



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#25070



<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>	



#25070



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25073



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection. I do not appreciate the new food scraps collection initiative and resent being charged an extra \$80 per annum for a service I have no need of. Choice would be a fine thing.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25073



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 do not appreciate the new food scraps collection initiative and resent being charged an extra \$80 per annum for a service I have no need of. Choice would be a fine thing.



#25073



I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25073



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25073



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25073



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25074



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#25074



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#25074



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-



#25074



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#25074



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25074



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25074



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25074



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25077



I reject all three options for rate increases.

The underlying principle to my submission is that every avenue to reduce cost must be explored before asking for more money and that requires novel

thinking, the Council has been run the same way for many decades with the same predictable results, so lets get creative and produce better results.

The Council needs to:-

Focus on core business activities only.

Spend our money as if they were spending their own last dollar.

Ask, how can we do this with less ?

Subject all expenditure to independent scrutiny.

Not promote incompetence.

Find ways to do more with less.

Encourage innovation.

Create a welcoming environment to encourage alternative vendors.

Incentivize efficiency, which means either do the same for less money or more with the same amount of money.

Incentivize staff who reduce costs.

Hire strictly based on competency.

Offer a 10,000.00 reward to every person that can come up with a plan to save that amount of money or more with the submissions and results open to

the public, I would expect a flood of suggestions and all sorts of innovative ideas to be presented.

Thank you for considering my submission.



#25077



Regards

Doug Kirby

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate increases.

The underlying principle to my submission is that every avenue to reduce cost must be explored before asking for more money and that requires novel

thinking, the Council has been run the same way for many decades with the same predictable results, so lets get creative and produce better results.

The Council needs to:-

Focus on core business activities only.

Spend our money as if they were spending their own last dollar.

Ask, how can we do this with less ?

Subject all expenditure to independent scrutiny.

Not promote incompetence.

Find ways to do more with less.

Encourage innovation.

Create a welcoming environment to encourage alternative vendors.

Incentivize efficiency, which means either do the same for less money or more with the same amount of money.



#25077



Incentivize staff who reduce costs.

Hire strictly based on competency.

Offer a 10,000.00 reward to every person that can come up with a plan to save that amount of money or more with the submissions and results open to

the public, I would expect a flood of suggestions and all sorts of innovative ideas to be presented.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Regards

Doug Kirby

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:



#25077



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25077



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25077



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25078



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential 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



#25078



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#25078



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those in the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



#25078



'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:



#25078



4c. If the 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



#25078



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25078



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25082



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25082



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25082



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:



#25082



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25082



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:



#25082



4c. If the 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>	



#25082



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25082



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

Kefe!!!!

I am writing to provide feedback on the



#25083



Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken



#25083



to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25083



1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Dear Auckland Council,

Kefe!!!!

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled



#25083



Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#25083



infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25083



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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



#25083



<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>	



#25083



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25084



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25084



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25084



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25084



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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 –



#25084



which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and



#25084



maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25084



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25084



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25084



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25085



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#25085



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get



#25085



smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25085



hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25085



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25085



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25085



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25085



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25085



<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?



#25086



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25086



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#25086



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get



#25086



smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25086



hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25086



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25086



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25086



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25086



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25086



<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?



#25088



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#25088



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should

be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland

ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being

deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and

wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to

capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:



#25088



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the

proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands

and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25088



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.



#25088



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#25088



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25088



4c. If the 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



#25088



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25088



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25089



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25089



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25089



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25089



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25089



should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25089



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25089



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?



#25089



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#25089



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25089



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25090



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25090



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25090



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



#25090



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25090



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25090



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25090



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25091



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25091



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25091



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25091



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25091



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25091



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25091



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25092



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25092



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25092



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



#25092



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25092



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?



#25092



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25092



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25092



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25094



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25094



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#25094



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#25094



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-



#25094



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#25094



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25094



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25094



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25094



<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?



#25096



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25096



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25096



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25096



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



#25096



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25096



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?



#25096



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#25096



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25096



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25097



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25097



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25097



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



#25097



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25097



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?



#25097



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25097



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25097



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#25098



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25098



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25098



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25098



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



#25098



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25098



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?



#25098



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25098



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25098



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25100



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25100



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25100



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

It would mean that i wouldnt eat, it would break me financially n thats just not fair.

Also stop the speed humps as its no stopping kids doing burn outs or stopping stolen cars as the fly over the one outside my house.

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



#25100



on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital



#25100



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's



#25100



proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

It would mean that i wouldnt eat, it would break me financially n thats just not fair.

Also stop the speed humps as its no stopping kids doing burn outs or stopping stolen cars as the fly over the one outside my house.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:



#25100



2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25100



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25100



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25103



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25103



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25103



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25103



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25103



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25103



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25103



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?



#25103



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25109



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25109



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25109



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#25109



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25109



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25109



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.	



#25109



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#25109



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25111



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25111



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25111



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



#25111



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25111



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?



#25111



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25111



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25111



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25113



(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25113



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25113



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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



#25113



preferred option is lowest option –
which is still much higher than inflation
despite it being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore
ways of preventing rates increases
over and above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful spending,
reining in Council-Controlled
Organisations, and reprioritising
money spent on operations and
staffing to capital and infrastructure
investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential
roles until an independent review has
been taken to address concerns of
overstaffing and the salaries of council
managers increasing much higher
than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary
marketing exercises and so-called
“traffic calming measures” (such as
unnecessary speed humps) by
Auckland Transport. This money



#25113



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25113



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25113



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25113



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25114



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#25114



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#25114



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



#25114



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#25114



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25114



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25114



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25114



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25115



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#25115



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get



#25115



smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25115



hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25115



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the



#25115



proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25115



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25115



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25115



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25117



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#25117



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure



#25117



investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25117



over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-



#25117



essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's



#25117



land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25117



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25117



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25117



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#25118



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth
to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#25118



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.



#25118



- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25118



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



#25118



deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25118



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#25118



infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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



#25118



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25118



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25118



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25119



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25119



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25119



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25119



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25119



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25119



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25119



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?



#25119



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25122



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25122



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25122



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



#25122



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25122



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?



#25122



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25122



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25122



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25124



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25124



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25124



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



#25124



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25124



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?



#25124



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25124



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25124



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25126



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25126



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25126



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



#25126



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25126



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?



#25126



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25126



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25126



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25128



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25128



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



#25128



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25128



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25128



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25128



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25129



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25129



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25129



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25129



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25129



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25129



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25129



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?



#25129



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25130



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#25130



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#25130



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



#25130



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#25130



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25130



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25130



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25130



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25131



(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25131



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25131



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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



#25131



preferred option is lowest option –
which is still much higher than inflation
despite it being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore
ways of preventing rates increases
over and above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful spending,
reining in Council-Controlled
Organisations, and reprioritising
money spent on operations and
staffing to capital and infrastructure
investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#25131



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25131



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25131



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25131



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25133



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25133



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25133



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



#25133



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25133



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?



#25133



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25133



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25133



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25134



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25134



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



#25134



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25134



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25134



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25134



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25138



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25138



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



#25138



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25138



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25138



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25138



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25139



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25139



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25139



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:



#25139



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25139



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:



#25139



4c. If the 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



#25139



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25139



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25143



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25143



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25143



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



#25143



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25143



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?



#25143



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25143



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25143



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#25148



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should
be limited to inflation and
the Council should cut its
cloth to reflect the current
economic circumstances
facing Auckland
ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it
being deceptively labelled
the “pay less, get less”
option.

I strongly urge Councillors
to explore ways of
preventing rates increases



#25148



over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#25148



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#25148



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.



#25148



Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address



#25148



concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund”



#25148



and the proposal to lease
Auckland Port's operations
to an expert external
operator while keeping the
Port's land in ratepayers'
hands and ringfencing that
money to invest in
infrastructure so that rates
and debt are 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?



#25148



3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25148



Tell us 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>	



#25148



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25150



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25150



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25150



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



#25150



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25150



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?



#25150



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25150



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25150



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25151



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25151



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25151



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25151



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25151



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25151



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25151



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?



#25151



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25153



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25153



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25153



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



#25153



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25153



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?



#25153



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25153



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25153



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25155



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25155



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25155



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



#25155



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25155



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?



#25155



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25155



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25155



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25157



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25157



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25157



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25157



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25157



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25157



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25157



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25162



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25162



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25162



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25162



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25162



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25162



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25162



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?



#25162



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25167



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25167



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25167



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



#25167



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25167



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?



#25167



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25167



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25167



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25168



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#25168



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#25168



in our Super City!

If increasing the rate to 38% is the only solution that you and your councillors have come up with and are adamant it's the only way, then it might be time for the whole office to step down and try some fresh new, young and old ideas.

This plan would most likely send people to suicide but in your minds, as long as the economy is in a better place than so be it.

Risking the lives of people for money and greed.

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



#25168



circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This



#25168



money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'

If increasing the rate to 38% is the only solution that you and your councillors have come up with and are adamant it's the only way, then it might be time for the whole office to step down and try some fresh



#25168



new, young and old ideas.

This plan would most likely send people to suicide but in your minds,as long as the economy is in a better place then so be it.

Risking the lives of people for money and greed.

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?



#25168



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25168



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25168



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25169



(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25169



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing



#25169



that money to invest in infrastructure
so that rates and debt are 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



#25169



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money



#25169



should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25169



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25169



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25169



Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25170



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25170



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25170



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



#25170



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25170



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?



#25170



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25170



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25170



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25175



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25175



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25175



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25175



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25175



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25175



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25175



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?



#25175



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25177



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25177



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25177



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



#25177



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25177



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?



#25177



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25177



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25177



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

Also; Stop closing the facilities that make our city fun.



#25178



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease



#25178



Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,

Also; Stop closing the facilities that make our city fun.

I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation

and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the

“pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining

in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.



#25178



This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease

Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in

infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25178



Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25178



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>	



#25178



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25180



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25180



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25180



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



#25180



and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25180



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?



#25180



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25180



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25180



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25181



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25181



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25181



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25181



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25181



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25181



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25181



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?



#25181



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25183



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25183



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25183



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25183



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25183



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25183



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25183



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?



#25183



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25184



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles



#25184



until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland



#25184



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



#25184



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport.

This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter



#25184



about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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:



#25184



4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25184



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25184



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25189



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and

the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25189



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



#25189



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25189



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25189



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25189



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25190



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25190



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25190



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:



#25190



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25190



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:



#25190



4c. If the 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>	



#25190



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25190



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,

I am writing to provide
feedback on the Mayor's



#25192



proposed Long-Term Plan
(10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for
rate hikes – the most
expensive of which would
see a 38% increase over
three years. Rates should be
limited to inflation and the
Council should cut its cloth to
reflect the current economic
circumstances facing
Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options
presented, my preferred
option is lowest option –
which is still much higher
than inflation despite it being
deceptively labelled the “pay
less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to
explore ways of preventing
rates increases over and
above inflation by cutting
back office and wasteful



#25192



spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core



#25192



council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!'



#25192



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.



#25192



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed



#25192



humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of



#25192



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?



#25192



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25192



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25192



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25193



Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and



#25193



staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure



#25193



investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25193



over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-



#25193



essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's



#25193



land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25193



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25193



Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the Long Term Differential Strategy which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools.	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#25193



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25195



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25195



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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).



#25195



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing



#25195



exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25195



2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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:



#25195



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us 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>	



#25195



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce recycling charges for schools .	
Continue the planned roll out of rates funded refuse collection to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25197



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25197



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25197



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



#25197



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25197



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?



#25197



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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.	
--	--



#25197



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25197



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Dear Auckland Council,



#25198



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore



#25198



ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain



#25198



transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of 'Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25198



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



#25198



preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25198



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in



#25198



infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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)?



#25198



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25198



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25198



Change the Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25199



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25199



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25199



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25199



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25199



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25199



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25199



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?



#25199



8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25200



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25200



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25200



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of



#25200



council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25200



Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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



#25200



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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	



#25200



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?



#25200



8. Do you have any other comments?



#25204



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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-



#25204



Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing



#25204



and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending



#25204



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-



#25204



Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator



#25204



while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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



#25204



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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?



#25204



<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25204



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25206



The Mayor has lost control of the city. I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland

Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are kept down.



#25206



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).

The Mayor has lost control of the city. I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years.

Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in

Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council

managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland



Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland

Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so

that rates and debt are 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)?



#25206



Proceed with the proposal

Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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:



#25206



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25206



<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: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25210



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25210



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



#25210



to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25210



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25210



<p>Resume the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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>	



#25210



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25211



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much



#25211



higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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?



#25211



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:



#25211



- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our



#25211



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:



#25211



4c. If the 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>	



#25211



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25211



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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



#25212



Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the



#25212



salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25212



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



#25212



infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.
- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.



#25212



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?



#25212



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us 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>	
---	--



#25212



Resume the **Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.

Broaden the description of bus services funded by the **Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)** to reduce the need to 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



#25212



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25213



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its

cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much

higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public



#25213



bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed "Future Fund" and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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.



#25213



I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above

inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to

address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much

higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming

measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should

be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.

- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public

bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's

proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert

external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that

money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of



#25213



'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:



#25213



4c. If the 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	



#25213



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to 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?



#25213



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: I don't know

Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council's Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do 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).



#25214



I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.



#25214



- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are 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,



#25214



I am writing to provide feedback on the Mayor's proposed Long-Term Plan (10-Year Budget).

I reject all three options for rate hikes – the most expensive of which would see a 38% increase over three years. Rates should be limited to inflation and the Council should cut its cloth to reflect the current economic circumstances facing Auckland ratepayers.

Of the three options presented, my preferred option is lowest option – which is still much higher than inflation despite it being deceptively labelled the “pay less, get less” option.

I strongly urge Councillors to explore ways of preventing rates increases over and above inflation by cutting back office and wasteful spending, reining in Council-Controlled Organisations, and reprioritising money spent on operations and staffing to capital and infrastructure investment.

This should include:

- A hiring freeze on all non-essential roles until an independent review has been taken to



#25214



address concerns of overstaffing and the salaries of council managers increasing much higher than those the private sector.

- Pausing expensive and unnecessary marketing exercises and so-called “traffic calming measures” (such as unnecessary speed humps) by Auckland Transport. This money should be used to fix roads and maintain transport infrastructure.
- Focusing on providing core council services such as effective waste management, public bins, and weekly rubbish collection.

I also call on the Council to get smarter about infrastructure investment. I support the Mayor's proposed “Future Fund” and the proposal to lease Auckland Port's operations to an expert external operator while keeping the Port's land in ratepayers' hands and ringfencing that money to invest in infrastructure so that rates and debt are kept down.

I endorse the submission of the Auckland Ratepayers' Alliance and back their vision of ‘Reasonable Rates, Sensible Spending in our Super City!’



#25214



2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Tell us why:

2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Tell us why:

4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the 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?



#25214



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.	



#25214



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR) to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of 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?



#25214



Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?