



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

**Written Feedback**

**Upper Harbour Volume #3**

April 2024



<b>Sub #</b>	<b>Organisation Name</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
10506	New Zealand Football	371
10517	Greenhithe Ecology Network	384
10834	Hobsonville Community Trust	453
11022	Upper Harbour Youth Council	508
11270	Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust	578
11868	Northern Region Football	739
14772	Business North Harbour Incorporated	1238
15498	North Shore City Baseball Club	1286
15513	North Harbour Softball Association	1298



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Health sector

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



**#9578**



Nothing

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Personally i have experienced how slow public transport can be sometimes so i strongly support the proposal to make transport better.

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

ensure public transport isn't late more often than not

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

maintaining the road as often

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

To better meet the needs of the northshore community instead of waiting until the stadium's conditions deteriorates and then proceeding with redeveloping the building.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#9578**



By proceeding with the proposal, this can help pay for council services as well as providing for the communities needs

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

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

**Tell us here:**

To me it seems a long term approach seems more worth it

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

This would help leave a service available that can help those in need in our wide community

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

**Tell us here:**

no

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

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

**Tell us why:**

It would be better for shipping



#9578



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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

don't know

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

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



#9578



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

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

no

## Local board priorities

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#9580**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

pretty satisfied with the proposal

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

could possibly redevelop for the needs of people

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#9580



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

nope these all sound pretty decent

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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

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

Support



#9580



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Other



#9580



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Fairly Important



#9580



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

they are all fairly important

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

i support

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

education, in all realms, primary, secondary and tertiary education.

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

n/a



**#9581**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport right now is decent.

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

N/A

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

train transport as not as many people use trains, and Personally I do not think Nz has enough people have a successful railroad network.

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

There could be more use for the stadium.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

to develop nz economy and develop our country.



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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Personally i do not know enough to have a proper say.

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I think that would be a the most sensible thing to do.

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

**Tell us here:**

N/A (i am running out of time)

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

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

**Tell us why:**

if it gives us significant financial benefit I think it is a good idea to change.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area





#9581



**Tell us why:**

I do not know enough but i feel it will be a sensible decision.

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

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



#9581



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

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

N/A

## Local board priorities

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

More support for university leavers renting or buying their first home

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



**#9582**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#9582



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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#9582



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



**#9582**



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

## **Local board priorities**

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

No

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





**#9584**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because everyday on the way to school there is always lots of traffic and surely do need to do more work on the road management. Also almost everyday there is car crashes which I think some of your proposal is reasonable.

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

No

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

Adult bus fare should be more cheaper like almost \$5+ for like one way ride is kind of too expensive which causes people to not choose bus alternative.

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Good for the community and beneficial

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#9584**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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



#9584



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



#9584



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Henderson-Massey

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

Very Important

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

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Very Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Very Important



#9584



Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

**Tell us why**

not sure

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

roads

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

buildings



**#9589**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

because we need busses

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

transportation

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

gas

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

because its fine right now

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

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



**#9589**



Other

**Tell us here:**

not sure

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

idk

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

**Tell us here:**

nothing

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk





#9589



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

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



#9589



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

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

no

## Local board priorities

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

roads

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

school and gas



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

because we need better quality busses

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

transportaiton

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

gas

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

because it is okay as it is

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

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



Other

**Tell us here:**

not sure

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

idk

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

**Tell us here:**

idk

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk



#9590



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

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



#9590



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

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

no thanks:)

### Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I don't know

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know



#9590



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

idk

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

idk

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know





**#9590**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

ikd

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Im not prepared to pay anymore for anything start firing people and reduce firverless spending, Smaller government

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



Stop holding up citizen owned development projects

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Making the traffic infrastructure more used friendly for motorists and reduce congestion times

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

Motory ways and roading

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

Cycle ways and anything climate change related

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

More community use could bring in future investment, Also more community use could add to the quality of life in the area

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

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#9603**



I dont want the future of Auckland city in the hands of a foregin headge fund manager like black rock or vangaurd. I want a New Zealand company to oversee Auckland assets

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

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

**Tell us here:**

Retaining asset ownership and having the intial cash investment is what i would do in this situation. It makes more finacial sense and also retain ownership of the asset while still generating income from it

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

Other

**Tell us here:**

Invest in roading and water infrastructure, Reduce council spending by fireing beuraucrats

Fir

e the people the labour govt hired

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

**Tell us here:**

N/A

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



#9603



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

**Tell us why:**

Makes no financial sense to annex the other wharves

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#9603



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

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

I want minimal to no increases in revenue gathering from rates, I would like to see aucklands assets be used effeciently to generate income and reduce the council workforce in the managerial sector to a minimum.

**Local board priorities**

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



#9603



Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

#### Tell us why



**#9603**



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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Thin the heard in council staff and reduce salaries

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Efficient and innovative waste management and recycling systems

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



**#9613**



Things like painting town centres blue and funding local community events are not important to me. Put that fun money towards something that actually needs improvement

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't use public transport because it's not convenient for family life and irregular work schedules and locations, therefore I haven't done any research into where improvements would really be beneficial vs the cost

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

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

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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



**#9613**



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

**Tell us here:**

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Just wasting time and money in the process, leave it as is, we have plenty of nice public facilities and commercial retail spaces so close to here, we don't need more

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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



#9613



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



#9613



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know



#9613



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I don't know what those plans are

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#9613**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively.





**#9635**



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per SLSNR's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

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

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us why:**

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



#9635



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

Tell us why:

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#9635



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

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



#9635



With regard to Question 1C, Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

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

Hibiscus and Bays, Waitākere Ranges

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

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

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	



#9635



Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.

**Tell us why**

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

I support all priorities

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Very Important

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

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	



#9635



Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

## Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

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

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

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	Very Important
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	
Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	



#9635



Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Surf Life Saving has a long standing partnership with Auckland Council. Most recently, it has partnered with Surf Life Saving through the previous LTP to deliver numerous capital refurbishment & rebuild projects of our clubs facilities. An updated proposal has been sent to Auckland Council for consideration to be included in the 2024-34 LTP. This proposal will see a contribution to fund a further four Surf Life Saving capital projects at Bethells Beach, Mairangi Bay, Omaha and Piha. Without this support, it will be exceedingly challenging for Surf Life Saving Northern Region to continue to fulfill its obligations as an Emergency Service(as listed in the Auckland Council Unitary Plan) in the long term.



Tēnā koe Mayor Brown,

**Re: Auckland Council - Long Term Plan - Auckland Surf 10:20 Capital Development Rebuilds**

Surf Life Saving Northern Region (SLSNR) is aware of their requirements to inform the current Auckland Council LTP process, specifically relating to the request for ongoing Auckland Council investment in our 'Surf 10:20' Lifesaving Facility Capital Redevelopment Programme.

The following sets out a high level forecast of the anticipated priorities for our programme of rebuilds. As in the past this order may sometimes change due to build readiness, or other factors. Additionally SLSNR has forecast the relevant contribution from Auckland Council based on the existing 35% contribution to the 'Lifesaving Footprint Cost'. Following the completion of the rebuilds of Bethells Beach and Mairangi Bay facilities, outside the need for any new facilities there is a smaller programme of redevelopments based on refurbishing the existing structures at Piha and Omaha.

While the summary that follows is limited to the ongoing Auckland Council funding investment in the existing programme of lifesaving facility redevelopments, as submitted to Auckland Council in March 2023, there is also a need to create a joint strategy ('Lifesaving Blueprint') beyond the status quo to complement the wider SLSNR investment in the 'Auckland Council Ten Year Plan' and better inform the location of current and future lifesaving services, whilst addressing the need for facilities and service delivery in new and emerging locations.

**Summary Table of Investment Sought and Forecast Timelines**

Priority	Location	Proposed Construction Date	Total Cost (incl. escalations)	Council Contribution
*	Bethells Beach <i>Cyclone damage</i> (rebuild)	*ASAP – current constraints around funding and consents*  Forecast – November 2024 if all funding secured	\$6.8mil	\$2.4mil
1	Mairangi Bay (rebuild)	November 2025	\$6.9mil	\$2.42mil
2	Piha (refurb)	2026	\$4.5mil est.	\$1.4mil
3	Omaha (refurb)	2027	\$4mil est	\$1.8mil
				\$8.02mil

**Proposed Timeline of Funding Drawdowns**

Financial Year	Anticipated funding to drawdown from Council
2025	\$2.4mil – Bethells Beach
2027	\$2.42mil – Mairangi Bay
2028	\$3.2mil – Piha and Omaha

This is the proposed drawdown schedule based on a one major project per financial year basis. If Council was not opposed SLSNR would promote a drawdown schedule that allowed the above funding to flow across multiple financial years or a three-year period so as not to stagger clubs unnecessarily. That is to say, a process that would support multiple clubs builds taking place in the same year if necessary.

Proudly Supported by:








For any further questions, or should any further information or detail be required, please get in touch.

Ngā mihi nui

  
General Manager



Address   
Email   
Mobile 

Proudly  
Supported by:





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Need to bring in a congestion tax or similar to reduce traffic at peak times

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

Cycleways as they provide an alternative to cars if safe routes are provided.

Bring on electric buses as soon as possible.

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

The previous management was more effective, and better connected to local community

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

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

**Tell us why:**

AIAL shareholding is a strategic asset. It will be important going forward to have some ability to influence airport development and changes.

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



**#9762**



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

**Tell us here:**

Need to retain flexibility to divest or develop land for community benefit in the next 20 years.

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

These are public assets and development will help to create a pathway from city to sea.

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

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



#9762



Tell us why:

Studies show that the port does not have a long term future so start planning now for other options.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#9762



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Fairly Important



#9762



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate



**#9762**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Infrastructure roll out into areas not currently serviced eg Sealed roads where gravel exists, reticulated wastewater and water. First into 'urban' areas which are not serviced, then adjacent rural (ie urban boundary) areas, to promote development and increase housing supply



**#9776**



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

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Core spend should be roading, the items listed above should be secondary/supporting

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

Roading

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

Public transport and cycleway projects that hardly anybody uses

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Selling land to fund a redevelopment makes sense, it should also reduce operational spend for the future

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

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#9776**



Don't create a new department which will cost more money to run, if you are going to sell them over time, just sell them and reduce debt

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

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

**Tell us here:**

Get cash injection upfront to reduce debt and rates to pay, while continuing to reap benefits from the lease, seems a win win

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain cook and marsed wharves, then sell/lease the land to private enterprise (eg hotel etc) to generate an upfront and/or ongoing revenue stream rather than more public spaces on the quay



#9776



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

Other

**Tell us why:**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Bledisloe Terminal, then sell/lease the land to private enterprise (eg hotel etc) to generate an upfront and/or ongoing revenue stream rather than more public spaces on the quay

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

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



#9776



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Rodney, Upper Harbour

## Rodney Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities



#9776



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

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Fairly Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Very Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Fairly Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Not Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Not Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Fairly Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Fairly Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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



#9776



As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I do not support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

Tell us why



**#9776**



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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

environmental monitoring - including air, land, and water - this includes quality, quantity, and, where applicable, biodiversity.

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



**#9784**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

raised pedestrian crossings and speed humps; reduction of road space for shared medians

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

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

**Tell us why:**

this is an asset, and worth keeping and operating; if it has not been operated well under existing management, then we should change the management;

we have plenty of other development opportunities;

the site is adjacent to Albany hub, which is already a development frenzy... I do not believe that we need additional areas for development at this stage

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

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

**Tell us why:**



**#9784**



disposal of assets is a short-term fix and is generally short-sighted;  
both the port and AIAL earn funds that support AC and Akl ratepayers

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

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

**Tell us here:**

If it cannot be managed adequately by the CCO, then we should look to fix that problem, not exit from managing the port;

there are many other risks associated with leasing the port operations - this has been illustrated multiple times with other NZ infrastructure

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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



#9784



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

My understanding is that it is a required component of port operations

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#9784



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#9784



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate



**#9784**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Perhaps upgrading libraries and allowing newer + more books in them.

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

Perhaps on improving outdoor parks





**#9854**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree with most of the plans, however, I believe that some of the money spent on transport could instead be spent on other, more pressing matters, such as education and on libraries.

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

No

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

No

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

I believe more people should be able to access and use the stadium.

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I'm not too sure on this one.



**#9854**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

I think that it would be best for the country if we began investing already.

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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



#9854



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



#9854



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important



#9854



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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



**#9911**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways creates safer environment for pedestrians and cyclists. However, public transport needs serious work and is well behind other cities of similar size so good to invest in this.

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Removing the stadium will mean no stadium will be on the North Shore and very little chance of there ever being one again. The stadium needs to be better utilised including the transport for events at the stadium. Need to look to host more events as well.

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know



#9911



Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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





#9911



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



#9911



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important



#9911



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Transport

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



**#9951**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

The congestion charging should be around the CBD rather than on the motorways.  
Other countries with similar schemes have done this.

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

Lower fare cap for people with concessions (since they pay lower fares to begin with) +  
day/annual passes in addition to the existing monthly pass

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

Adding additional lanes to roads that don't need them

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

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

### Tell us why:

Redevelopment should only include improvement rather than demolition

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

Other

### Tell us why:

The future fund is a nice thing to have. But I'm not keen on selling more assets for it



**#9951**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

Selling away control of a key part of Auckland for 35 years is not great when the attempted goal is the "future" of Auckland.

Can't use the land for planned waterfront redevelopment during those 35 years

The amount of money from the lease seems like a quite low amount for 30 years

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#9951



Tell us why:

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

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



#9951



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour, Waitemata

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I don't know

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Fairly Important





#9951



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate



#9951



Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

## Waitematā Local Board Priorities

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

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

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	I don't know
Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	Fairly Important
Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Fairly Important
Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitematā	



**#9951**



including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.

**Tell us why**

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#9963**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Some previously planned initiatives should not be cancelled. I believe that it would be good to continue with it.

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

If it's not being used much, the money that is used for its maintenance is not really necessary. It could be used for other things that more people in the North Shore would use.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

better air transport

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

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



#9963



Tell us here:

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

Do not support



#9963



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Do not support



#9963



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

Other

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Fairly Important





#9963



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Surf life saving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their life saving work effectively.



**#9994**



Without the fit for purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than 100 years of keeping our beaches safe.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf life saving facilities, as per Surf Life Saving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development Proposal.

Mairangi Bay Surf Life Saving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises 150 active lifeguards, over 500 junior surf children aged 6 - 14yrs and a further 600 associate members, The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue to be able to serve the membership and the wider community.

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

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It would be a real shame to lose this asset. There must be a way to alter things such that the stadium is used for more events - be they sporting or otherwise.



**#9994**



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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us why:**

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



#9994



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



#9994



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

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

With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

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

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important



#9994



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

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Fairly Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Fairly Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year.

**Tell us why**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#9994**



8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

Plan road closures or digging up the same site over and over again!



**#10005**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I want Auckland to be a great place and sick of things being taken away

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

Better public transport

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

Bureaucracy

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Through council management this has gone down hill, take it back to private management with council ownership.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This way the best can happen with the money. Shares sold or not but clear expectations for the best returns should be given to the management and leave the council up to doing projects with the output.



**#10005**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

Again not a councils strong suit to run a port and without the ability to really push a direction.

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Move the funding operations out of council hands and to people who understand the finance world

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

The port doesn't need to be smaller but must be managed well for its size. A limit should also be imposed on moving into the Harbour more. We are a city of boats NOT ports



#10005



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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#10005



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#10005



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate



**#10005**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Follow through on proposed cycleways and close the huge gaps in the cycling network. Consultations often feel like they are done without following through on the project afterwards. Even interim painted cycle lanes while we wait for the proper infrastructure will achieve improvements.

Include improved active modes in all road renewals.





**#10053**



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

Stop all spending that supports greenfield developments and instead focus on the existing urban limits. We need a compact city and any infrastructure spending required for greenfield development should be entirely covered by developers.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I support public transport investments and initiatives like the weekly fare cap on public transport.

I do not agree with stopping safety improvements and cycleways

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

Follow through on proposed cycleways and close the huge gaps in the cycling network. Even interim painted cycle lanes while we wait for the proper infrastructure will achieve improvements. For example, a cycleway was consulted on last year for Hobsonville Road, which I strongly support. I am worried that it will be years before its implementation, despite the consultation mentioning construction to start in 2024. Yellow broken lines where there is currently curb parking will achieve benefits for cyclists at a very low cost.

Give Auckland Transport stronger direction on reallocating road space to public transport and active modes.

Include improved active modes in all road renewals.

Increase parking charges.

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

Stop all spending that supports greenfield developments and instead focus on the existing urban limits. We need a compact city and any infrastructure spending required for greenfield development should be entirely covered by developers.



**#10053**



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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#10053



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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	Support



#10053



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

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

Rates funded refuse collection: I support a rates funded refuse collection if it simplifies funding, however with the rollout of the food scraps collection, the general waste collection should be a) fortnightly only to lower cost, and b) add another smaller bin size around 40l or 35l at a lower cost. We are a family of 3 and carefully recycle, compost and use the food scraps bin, our 80l general rubbish bin is only full after 4-5 weeks. We still live a normal life, so this level of waste should be achievable by most 2-3 people households.

**Local board priorities**

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



#10053



Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

Tell us why



**#10053**



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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

I don’t know

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

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

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

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

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

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

I don't know





#10083



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#10083



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

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



**#10083**



## Local board priorities

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

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Concentrate transport investment in public transport and active modes. Road traffic will naturally maintain itself at a level were it takes approximately the same time as public/active transport to complete a trip. Encouraging uptake in public/active



#10086



transport but improving the speed (and for active transport safety) will speed up the journeys of all modes.

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

Reduce support for residential developments on the fringes of the city. The additional cost of infrastructure (not to mention the time cost for the transport of those who live in monoculture suburbs) greatly exceeds the cost of increasing density closer to the city centre (density that should be done to support mixed use).

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

As per my answer to 1c, improving journey times for general traffic will only lead to induced demand and increased general traffic that will slow travel down again. Improvements to public transport will speed up all journeys by reducing car volumes on the roads.

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

Public transport and active mode development.

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

Improvements in roading that don't directly impact on public/active transport.

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

Other

**Tell us why:**

I would like to propose a slightly different redevelopment, The size of the stadium greatly exceeds the requires of the matches held there and moving the rare game that does require (close to) the full capacity to another stadium is the right approach.



**#10086**



I would suggest reviewing what other facilities, particularly on the North Shore, could be co-located with the footprint of the current stadium to make best use of the shared facilities (parking, catering, etc). Building a indoor arena of similar scope to Pulman Arena as part of any grandstand structure and as a replacement for Eventfinda stadium would be my suggestion.

Eventfinda is now over 30 years old and located in a flood zone, parts of it were yellow stickered for several months after the Anniversary Weekend floods and the basketball and gymnastic equipment onsite was damaged. The environment inside is not pleasant for crowds, when the Breakers played there on a humid summer evening (which was most games) moisture dripped from the ceiling onto the crowd for the second half of the game. The facility is now too small to host school age basketball tournaments without playing games 12 hours a day. During or shortly after this 10 year period the issue of a replacement for eventfinda is going to come up and killing two birds with one stone seems like the smart thing to do.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**

Leasing the port for 35 years will tie the council's hands when dealing with the port. There will be no option for relocation of the port in that time period without payment of a lease break fee that is likely to exceed the fee that has been paid.

Additionally the fee paid for the lease is for commercial reasons not going to exceed what the council could make from maintaining direct operation of the port unless either



**#10086**



health and safety practices are seriously compromised or prices for shippers are increased to a level that impacts on trade in the city.

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Prime waterfront land (ok wharf) is not best used as a carpark.

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

The correct action here depends on changes in freight volumes and any relocation of PoA capacity to other sites. If PoA remains with the current requirements that it has now (plus growth from population increases), removing Bledisloe Terminal from their operating area would result in a requirement for other reclamation to replace the space.



#10086



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

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





#10086



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

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

On the rollout of rates funded refuse collection, I would push for this to be in the other direction.

Linking the cost of refuse collection directly to use of the service encourages a reduction in rubbish being generated. I live in an area that currently requires bin tags and manage to keep my refuse collection to once every 3-4 weeks by minimizing my household non-recyclable waste.

**Local board priorities**

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

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
--	----------------



#10086



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Albany Library is a very well used facility, so much so that it is extremely difficult to get a park near there on the weekend. I would prefer a targeted rate to fund a replacement as opposed to selling assets. A left field suggestion on a replacement w

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#10086**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

As above consider making it a true multi-purpose facility by co-locating with other council owned facilities in the area.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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



**#10099**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#10099



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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

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

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



#10099



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



**#10099**



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

## **Local board priorities**

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

Heaps more stadiums to cater for lots of different sports.

More boat ramps and parking for recreational boating.



**#10108**



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

Bike lanes, art sculptures,

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Roads are the key to a vibrant and moving city

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

Motorways to cut down traffic waiting times

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

Light rail

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Need more multi sport complexes

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#10108**



We need to take proper action to get ourselves put of this rut we are in

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

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

**Tell us here:**

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

No doubt it would end up in general revenue and the fat cats in the ivory towers would waste it away

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#10108



Tell us why:

Massive opportunity to turn it into something special like Docklands in Vic

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#10108



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Very Important



#10108



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land



**#10108**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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





**#10169**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This used to be a facility hosting many kinds of activity, but it now seems to be asleep. It seems like fresh energy and thinking is needed.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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



#10169



Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

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

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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



#10169



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

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



#10169



## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	



**#10169**



Tell us why

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

Streamline management



**#10174**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#10174



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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





#10174



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



**#10174**



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

## **Local board priorities**

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

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Indoor / outdoor sporting facilities.

More public rubbish bins

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



**#10205**



Less changes to childrens playgrounds. They seem to be updated way too often.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We're already paying the tax might as well use it to improve our city

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

We have a great stadium with a great way of getting there, we just need more events to justify it.

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Don't sell the airport shares.

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



**#10205**



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

**Tell us here:**

We always regret selling all of our assets.

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

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

I think we will need more space for the ports of auckland- perhaps somewhere else

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

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

**Tell us why:**



#10205



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

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



#10205



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important



#10205



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

We don't need a new library in Albany-





**#10205**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10241**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

It doesn't seem to be used that often so seems like a waste

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#10241



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

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#10241



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



#10241



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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important



#10241



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

Reduce unnecessary spending on beautification and design of public amenities. Amenities e.g. pedestrian crossings need to function, but spending ratepayer funds to make it look good is not what ratepayers want from Council. Council and CCOs must





**#10259**



focus on provision of basic services i.e. water, waste, parks, libraries first and foremost.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

The amount of money Council (via AT) is paying for raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways is eye watering and indefensible when core council services such as water infrastructure (sewage leaks), waste management (reduction of bins around the city) and maintenance of parks are being reduced as part of cost cutting measures.

Council needs to refocus on it's core duties.

Gold plating all projects must stop.

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

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

Raised pedestrian road crossing, traffic cones (contractors are making a fortune!)

The number of roads in Auckland where contractors have placed cones is ridiculous. Does anyone from council drive to check whether any work is actually being done? Most time there are cones and contractor vehicles but no one actively working. Is council actively managing these projects and ensuring they are not stretched out to favour contracting companies?

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**



**#10259**



For council to generate enough revenue to maintain a stadium of this size (45,000 capacity), it needs to hold a few sold-out events a year, but the last sizeable crowd in this stadium was 7 years ago (32,000).

There is no economic justification for ratepayer money to be spent on the continued maintenance. It should be redeveloped to something better fit for purpose.

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The proposal makes great business sense which is how council should look at this.

Aucklanders did not vote for council to purchase shares in Auckland Airport and it was a poor investment decision to start with.

If council has ratepayer funds to invest, managed funds is the right choice as the risk is diversified amongst the many different company shares/assets that the fund invests in.

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

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

**Tell us here:**

Leasing the port operations is the right thing to do as it provides Council and Auckland ratepayers with income that goes into the Auckland Future Fund.

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

Other



#10259



**Tell us here:**

Council should not continue to operate Port of Auckland.

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#10259



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

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



#10259



## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important



**#10259**



Tell us why

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10267**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Don't spend any more than is necessary on CRL, it has cost FAR TOO MUCH and will only benefit a relatively small part of the Auckland population.

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

Fixing pot holes

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

Less bike lanes, raised pedestrian crossings

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

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

**Tell us why:**

It has been a great stadium in the past with sports, concerts, events, school balls etc. Unfortunately the costs for hiring it have made it unaffordable and due to no income coming in it has been left to get rundown. If it is taken away or supposedly replaced, it will NEVER happen and the North Shore will lose their only large stadium.

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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





#10267



I don't know

Tell us here:

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

I don't know

Tell us here:

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

Tell us here:

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

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

Tell us why:

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

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

I don't know



#10267

around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#10267



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

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

### Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support all priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Fairly Important



#10267



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

The Albany Village Library has been in so-called "Temporary premises" for 20 years (only meant to be 5-6 years). It has massively outgrown it's building and would benefit from being in a more central location to enable those without cars or who use public

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#10267**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

TOTALLY against DEMOLISHING the North Harbour Stadium - total waste of money.  
Needs to be better managed



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10296**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Tolls. Most major cities toll the motorways. Why can't you toll aucklands motorways? People will moan at first but they will pay. See how successful the Oweria to Puhoi leg is. There will be an initial set up fee of course with technology but long term the benefits out way the cost. Make the tolls \$1 - \$2 each way so it does not break the bank. I travel the mway and will pay if it gets Auckland moving. If government will not allow it then send them a bill for lost revenue and use of land. Just a thought.

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

Rubbish bins near parks and high foot traffic areas. You have removed some of ours and the litter is building up.

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

This stadium is not being used by the community enough. Looking to the future Auckland will benefit with a stadium on the Northshore. It is ashame it was not built closer to the bus ways

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

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#10296**



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

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

**Tell us here:**

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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

Auckland needs the money from the Port to get back on track.

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

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

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





#10296



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



#10296



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

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

## Local board priorities

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

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

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

I support most priorities

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

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know



#10296



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

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

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

Good pies.

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



**#10332**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because I don't agree with it.

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

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

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

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

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

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us here:**



#10332



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

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

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

**Tell us here:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

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

**Tell us why:**

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

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



#10332



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



#10332



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

### Local board priorities

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

Aotea/Great Barrier

### Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

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

Other

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

Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works.	Not Important
Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets.	Fairly Important
Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide.	Fairly Important
Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan.	Not Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

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

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

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

Proceed with the central proposal

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

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

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

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

Ensure facilities are affordable for local sporting bodies to rent these rather than the current inflated costs that means no one hires them.



**#10351**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

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

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

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

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

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

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

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#10351



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#10351



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10351



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important



#10351



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10356**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know





#10356



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10356



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#10356



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

### Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I do not support most priorities



#10356



## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

Fairly Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	I don't know
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	I don't know
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	I don't know
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

Tell us why



**#10356**



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

make rich pay tax

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

less debt and lower overall cost of living



**#10357**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#10357



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	I don't know





#10357



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#10357**



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



#10358

# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#10358**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The proposal is good since there is a guarantee that the bus transport will be better than it is now, I guess.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

It depends

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Depends

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#10358



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

I don't know



#10358

around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



**#10358**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Nothing.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Nothing.





**#10362**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Unconditional support

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

.I'm not going there.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I have no idea

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10362**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I know these very well

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

not understand well

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

not sure

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

It will be all right

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Not sure



#10362



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#10362



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

very satisfied

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I don't

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I don't



**#10370**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It can make transportation more convenient and optimize the network.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It can ensure that the community can make more use of the space.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10370**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't know

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't know

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know



#10370



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#10370



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

town center and regional development, recreational facilities

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

houses



**#10373**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Recreation facilities and town center and regional development

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

transportation expenses

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10373**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

have no idea

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

have no idea

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No, no, no

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

have no idea



#10373



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#10373



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Downtown and regional development, recreational facilities.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

houses.



**#10374**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't know

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Recreation facilities and town centre and regional development

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Transportation

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





**#10374**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

have no idea

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

have no idea

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

have no idea

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

have no idea



#10374



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#10374



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

i do not know

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

i do not know



**#10378**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i just do not have a stans on it

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i dnot know

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i dnot understand

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10378**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

you can still make money just let people have a try

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

i dnot know what a future fund is

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

?

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

just do what needs to be done

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



#10378



i think there are better ways to do it

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide</p>	



#10378



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10385**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think the cycleways are good.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#10385



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#10385



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



**#10385**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10391**



no

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

we need more civilian walkway and bike ways, so there are less car.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

spend more money on school, and student welfare,

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

lots of people in the north shore go to and use it.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

not sure



**#10391**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

not sure

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

use it to fund the community

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

they have no significant value to the council

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

the council has no use for it





#10391



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#10391



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important



#10391



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

not sure

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

we need to focus more on weest harbour area

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know



**#10391**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

increase taxes for NZ (so everyone pays a tiny amount), then make them back to normal and make the library free

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	As proposed
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#10393**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport should be faster

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The stadium is fine as it is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know what this means

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10393**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The Port of Auckland is fine as it is

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

The Port of Auckland is fine as it is

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

It's fine as it is

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#10393



It's fine as it is

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	





#10393



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No...

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No...



**#10395**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

because every options makes different results..? So I don't know what to choose

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No...

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No...

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Same reason as the transport proposal

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Same reasons as the top questions ;-;

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10395**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't know ;-;

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

;-;

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No, these questions are too hard for my brain ;;;;

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#10395



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#10395



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I don't have any feedback

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The school wanted me to do this but m brain isn't smart enough to understand these questions, sorry ;-;



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

N/A

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



N/A

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think the public transport in this country could improve a lot, however we do need to be aware of budgets and cost of improving things.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

N/A

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

N/A

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Because we need to be aware of budgets and the cost of things.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**





**#10406**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

N/A

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**Tell us why:**

N/A

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#10406



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10406



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

N/A

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important



#10406



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

N/A

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

N/A

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know



**#10406**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

N/A

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

]

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

]



#10416



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

]

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

]

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

]

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

]

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

]

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10416**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

]

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

]

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

]

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No idea what this is

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**





#10416



NO idea what this is

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#10416



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waitākere Ranges

## Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

No idea

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	I don't know
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	I don't know



#10416



Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	I don't know
Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	I don't know
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	I don't know
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	I don't know
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	I don't know
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	I don't know
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I don't know

**7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

No idea

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10425**



Making more cycle ways and unnecessary over the top pedestrian crossings(example the one in The Avenue, Albany) total waste of money

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I am rurally based and I have no public transport options available to me, we should not be part of the wider Auckland City Plan, it is just for people living in highly populated areas.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

As my comment above raised unnecessary pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

It is an asset to the North Shore and should be better maintained and therefore utilised. I understand this falls under the council and they have slowly let it deteriorate. It was built and paid for by North Shore residents why was the upkeep taken away from them.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#10425**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Auckland Airport belongs to Aucklanders, why do you want to sell off our assets for a fast buck, The return the council gets from the ownership of the Airport should be of ongoing benefit to all Aucklanders.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Auckland Port belongs to Aucklanders not Foreign Ownership, A very short sighted monetary gain for council coffers. Any reduction in rates would be offset with the increased cost of using the port (Shipping Lines, Transport Companies) and hence putting the cost of goods up dramatically for all New Zealanders.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

As it is a council owned business run by the Port of Auckland any dividend paid to the council should be used to the benefit of Aucklanders.;

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The ownership of the POA and the operational land it occupies should stay with the people of Auckland.



#10425



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

You have explained why above its a no win situation for anyone. Plus there would be massive development costs. Leave Captain Cook, Marsden wharves and Bledisloe as is and use the money gained from the port operation for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Bledisloe already provides benefit by adding to the dividends paid by the port to the council. To move this operation elsewhere would considerably increase the cost of consumables for all New Zealanders. Why would anyone want to do that, The cost of living is out of control now. Plus of course there is the unemployment this would cause.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate	Support



#10425



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No further comment





#10425



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important



**#10425**



**Tell us why**

A new Library in Albany is not necessary, we have one which is more than adequate, Why on earth do we need rate payers money spent on more sports fields, ridiculous, a roundabout at the bottom of The Avenue would be money far better spent.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Not a great deal,

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

We do not need to waste money on a new library,

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

NO



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More bike paths and better walking paths.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10427**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't think we have a need fo raised pathways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I've never been there so I have no opinion.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#10427



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I support the majority of what the future fund is trying to do it would be a good thing if there was more funding.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#10427



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10427



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important



#10427



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

I'm not sure about most of those things but public education and stopping climate change are both very important things for the nations future.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I'm not sure

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Making public transport cheaper and more efficient and can you pretty please move the 112 back to Westgate instead of northwest thank you :)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10428**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Don't make life worse for pedestrians and cyclists they should have the highest priority alongside with public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#10428**



**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Its debatable but in my memory that is where the cruise ship comes in and we don't want to hinder them

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

that could be used to make a landmark for the cruisers to see when they land in Auckland and also just for people to look at and go wow even Aucklanders

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#10428



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#10428



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better bike paths.

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10431**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I never found the raised crossways useful

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know nor participate things about the stadium.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#10431



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Invest for better future

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support





#10431



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#10431**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More public basketball courts

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less houses at Hobsonville point, we already have enough traffic to deal with



**#10436**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think that the transport is as good as it is right now

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Nothing

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

LESS FRCIKIN TRAFFIC IN HOBSONVILLE POINT..... IT SUCKS

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Its perfect

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Not sure, I believe it should stay how it is currently

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10436**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I'm not to intelligent about this certain topic

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Not sure just keep it stable

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No I believe it is running smoothly

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

keep it goin

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#10436



???????

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	I don't know



#10436



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I don't have any request or feedback

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Franklin,Papakura,Waitākere Ranges

### Franklin Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Franklin in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Develop fit for purpose facilities and respond to growth challenges through projects like the Clevedon Village Heart programme, 'Belmont' Sports Park	Very Important
---	----------------



#10436



development and the Unlock Pukekohe programme.	
Fund three-year Strategic Community Partnerships with local organisations that are willing to and capable of delivering social, environmental, cultural and economic outcomes in line with the local board plan and support to these organisations to deliver.	Very Important
Support environmental and cultural restoration programmes in partnership with Iwi including Te Kete Rukuruku (place naming) and Te Korowai Papatuaanuku (environmental restoration).	Very Important
Develop “Franklin Community Occupancy Guidelines” to inform decisions on council-owned facility leases, including leasing charges.	Fairly Important
Find ways to reduce Franklin’s maintenance costs e.g. by replacing lawn with eco-sourced native trees and reducing or relocating public rubbish bins.	Very Important
Progress the development and delivery of the Franklin Paths Programme.	Very Important
Deliver a refreshed approach to enabling young people in Franklin to access services and participate in their communities.	I don't know
Progress a Pukekohe Cemetery memorial project that acknowledges the unmarked graves at the site.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

I cant think of an explanation





#10436



7c. What do you think of the Franklin proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Not sure

Do you have any additional thoughts on the proposed Franklin Paths Targeted Rate?

I don't know

As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities

Not from the Franklin area

## Papakura Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Papakura in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

We know you value the community being brought together through free events which we will continue to support including the Anzac day events. This is particularly special to our area given the strong military history in Papakura.	I don't know
We will continue to support Māori-led initiatives and aspirations with Mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge), including the Māori Wardens. We also are pleased to partner with mana whenua in the delivery of Te Kete Rukuruku project which is the dual naming and storytelling of our parks and reserves.	I don't know
We have recently been working on enhancements to the Te Koiwi Reserve	I don't know



#10436



pond and are looking at further work that can be done in this area.	
We will continue to support the Takanini Business Association in their Business Improvement District (BID) establishment.	I don't know
Papakura has a talented and culturally rich community, and we will continue to showcase this through the community arts programme.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I don't know

**7c. What do you think of the Papakura proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I don't know

**Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	I don't know
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	I don't know
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	I don't know



#10436



Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	I don't know
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	I don't know
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	I don't know
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	I don't know
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	I don't know
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I don't know

**7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I think it is a solid proposal

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I have zero comments

FIX THE TRAFFIC IN HOBSONVILLE POINT #10436

822



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10443**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

fine

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The money can be used for other things.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#10443



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

I don't know



#10443



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know





**#10443**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No.



**#10459**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

If the transport proposal is efficient and there is more of, I think it would be better so that people wouldn't have to walk too far because there aren't many close bus stops near where they live.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No, because I do not want to spend a lot of money on things.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No, because the prices are fair but because of inflation the prices are more expensive than before.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

I don't go to the North Harbour Stadium, but for others it would be nice redeveloping the stadium so that there is more space.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#10459**



Establish Future Fund because that sounds nice we can build more stuff and have safer roads to cross for blind people, young children, and old people, etc.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

The port for Auckland I am unsure of because I've never been there and if I did, I would have no idea what to do for the future of it.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I don't know because I don't know how the preference of other people is for the profits and dividends used for the port.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No I don't because I've no idea what to do with the port and can't think of any good changes or how to profit from it.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know where and what that is because I don't travel much.



#10459



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't know what Bledisloe Terminal is.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10459



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Transportation.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No I don't.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**





#10464



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10464



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?



**#10464**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10466**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#10466



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10466



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#10466**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#10474**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#10474



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#10474



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10474



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important



#10474



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10477**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know





#10477



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10477



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#10477**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10483**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

cuz I don't understand much

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#10483



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

cuz then they don't loose a lot of money

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't understand the question

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
---	---------------------



#10483



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#10483



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Aotea/Great Barrier, Upper Harbour

### Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works.	Very Important
Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets.	Not Important
Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide.	Very Important
Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

u





#10483



7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

Tell us why



**#10483**



**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More teenager recreation activities

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10485**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

MADE IN NEW ZEALAND!!!

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#10485



made in new Zealand!!!

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#10485



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#10485**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

NO



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Do more to promote different ethnicities maybe. Such as Europeans

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#10486**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport is sometimes a bit stressful

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#10486



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#10486



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#10486**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): New Zealand Football

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10506**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#10506



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#10506



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





## Submission Auckland Council LTP

***Football is Auckland's most popular sport, and more Aucklanders participate in football than any other sport.***

### **Thank Council as football's largest investor.**

- We're very thankful for the vital role Auckland Council plays as the major provider of sport and recreation facilities. Without Council's support and investment, many Aucklanders would not have the opportunities to take part in sport and recreation in their communities.

### **Football is rapidly growing.**

- **Growth:** Football across the NZF northern region has seen considerable growth over the last 5 years. This includes an average of 4% per annum from 2019 to 2022 (during lockdowns) and 9% from 2022 to 2023.
  - **Junior Growth** 41% from 2019 to 2023
  - **Girls and Women Growth** 24% from 2019 to 2023
- After FIFA Women's World Cup 2023, early indications show this season's growth is similar to 2023.
- **Pressure on current space:** Demand and supply modelling as part of the NZF Northern Regional Football Facilities Plan shows there is already a shortfall in allocated space, particularly for accommodating floodlit activity. This shortfall will only be exacerbated with the continuing growth. It is also providing some series challenges in terms of the quality and sustainability of pitches.
- **Pitch quality and sustainability:** 2022 and 2023 saw a rapid rise in poor pitch quality restricting play and training across many sites. While NZF are working with Council teams to understand how adjustments can support better outcomes, without greater investment into this area communities will be limited in their ability to recreate through football.
- **Your clubs challenges with growth, quality turf and lighting;**

### **Council Operations**

- **Reviewing maintenance cost and contracts:** We fully support reviewing costs and contracts for sports field maintenance. Inconsistent quality and accountability need addressing to improve the usability of our existing facilities and to preserve these assets for as long as possible. In particular, Full Facility Contracts seem to have resulted in contractors maximising profit rather than quality leading to a poor return on investment for Council and community.
- **Support for Council Staff:** Councils five Maintenance Co-ordinators look after an average of 150 sports fields across 50 sports parks. This model is not sustainable and we are supportive of this team receiving more resource and more autonomy to make decisions that provide quality outcomes for pitches and sports parks.
- **Your clubs' challenges with maintenance, renovations and contractors;**



**New Zealand  
Football**

- **Better Systems:** Both the bookings and maintenance teams require investment into internal and public facing systems that help them function more effectively, reducing administrative burden and providing a better experience for clubs, community and field users. We are fully supportive of investment for these teams to see public facing renovation and maintenance information across parks as well as live bookings information and data.
- **Re-allocation of space:** We support the improvement in quality of the current sport park network to increase available use time however, footballs current growth trajectory means that we are likely to outgrow that space. We support a review to reallocate unused or underutilised sports fields to support the growth in football and to support our community in being active.

#### **Key initiatives feedback:**

- **Support for the LTP Funding Proposal:** We endorse retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund, supporting an additional \$35m investment, and propose the additional funding be non-contestable and used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to indoor sports facilities. This will be vital to developing the sports and recreation facilities Aucklanders want and need.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More environmental care and protecting/restoring native endangered species, as well as more green spaces such as parks and forest.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10513**



Less development of native habitat into urban areas.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I believe that public transport should be improved, because currently there are several issues with these things. Some ferries are often delayed or cancelled, and are extremely unreliable. However, I disagree with stopping the initiatives relating to cycleways, as that is a common method of environmental transport and ceasing it will discourage people from cycling.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I would spend more on the improvement of transport, but making sure that it does not have any negative environmental effects.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

So far, there is nothing I would spend less on.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I believe that it would be more efficient to keep the stadium precinct as it is.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know



**Tell us why:**

I feel more information is required for me to make a decision.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I agree with this plan as long as the money earned is going towards a good cause.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I believe that things are fine as they are currently.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I do not have anything of particular importance to say.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#10513



As long as native marine species are not impacted, I would prefer the land to be used for public benefit.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

As long as native marine species are not impacted, I would prefer the land to be used for public benefit.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Do not support



#10513



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I believe that natural habitats and species should be considered before any developments.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour



#10513



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

#### Tell us why

I believe it is very important to take more environmental action, and most of the others are also fairly important. I do not know what 'stage 1b' is.

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?





**#10513**



I do not know.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

I do not.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I do not have any other comments, except that in my opinion climate effects and the health native species should be properly considered in any decisions made.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Greenhithe Ecology Network

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10517**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#10517



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by	Support



#10517



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?



#10517



I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell**



**#10517**



land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no





**#10534**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because if we support all of the proposal then we will live better

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Because it is perfect just the way it is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i dont know what it is

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10534**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Ive never been there

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Because this way the construction can be finished faster

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I dont

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

They have been doing well already so why should we change them.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I dont know what that is



#10534



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#10534



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I dont

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10535**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Because i use public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

So it has a better stadium close

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I dont know

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#10535



Because i use the the ferry

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I dont know

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

ni

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i dont know

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I dont know

**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

I don't know



#10535



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>





#10535



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10549**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Pedestrianise the city centres.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is not functioning as fully and efficiently as it should. Reduce the size and build again later on as growth happens.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We have to balance the books. We cannot afford to continue to pay huge interest.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other



**#10549**



**Tell us here:**

This needs to be developed and no longer an eye sore on Auckland. We need to build better and far more smarter and attract more tourists here to spend. We have to get real and look to the trends already happening with the best cities in the world. It's been far too long waiting around with the status quo. The Sydney opera House put Sydney on the World Map. What can Auckland have? Start now so that we are far better set up for 10-20 years ahead.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

This needs to be developed and no longer an eye sore on Auckland. We need to build better and far more smarter and attract more tourists here to spend. We have to get real and look to the trends already happening with the best cities in the world. It's been far too long waiting around with the status quo. The Sydney opera House put Sydney on the World Map. What can Auckland have? Start now so that we are far better set up for 10-20 years ahead.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This needs to be developed and no longer an eye sore on Auckland. We need to build better and far more smarter and attract more tourists here to spend. We have to get real and look to the trends already happening with the best cities in the world. It's be



#10549



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

This needs to be developed and no longer an eye sore on Auckland. We need to build better and far more smarter and attract more tourists here to spend. We have to get real and look to the trends already happening with the best cities in the world. It's been far too long waiting around with the status quo. The Sydney opera House put Sydney on the World Map. What can Auckland have? Start now so that we are far better set up for 10-20 years ahead.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10549



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Howick, Upper Harbour



#10549



## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

Tell us why



#10549



**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support all priorities

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	Fairly Important
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	Fairly Important
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	Very Important
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	Fairly Important
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	Very Important
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead	





#10549



to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important



#10549



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

i dont want to pay more for anything i can barley afford school lunch

(but also yes yall should put a smooth walkway on kauri rd because i wanna ride my skateboard to school)

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10564**

idk what you need to do to make food cheaper but you NEED to do that

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

we dont even wanna be in traffic in the first place why would we wanna pay to be in it thats so stupid thats not gonna fix anything

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

i dont even have money but if i did i would spend it on footpaths on kauri road  
PLEASEERRRRRREEE E

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

food and gas and food and food

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i dont care

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i dont know what that is



**#10564**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

i dont care

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

idk

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#10564



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10564



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

im excited for my free pizza

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

i hope my slice of pizza will be big



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No





**#10585**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

bECAUSE ITS GOOD.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

nOPE

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

nOpe

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

stadiums are amazing.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

good proposal.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10585**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

good.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

good

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

nothing nope no

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

good

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#10585



Tell us why:

nice

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#10585



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

nothing no feedback i am soooo satisfied by the auckland council.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I dont have any other comments.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More fast food chains from the US, better school education and WiFi.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Housing and Land.



**#10594**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Transport is not the best at the moment, having better transport will make everyone's lives more efficient and quicker.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Not that I can think of.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

I'm not the expert so nothing.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

I don't think the stadium needs to have so much money spent towards it. Spend the money on better causes.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Sounds good for the country and community.



**#10594**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

If it is for better profit. The port is very important for the economy.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Really not sure, whatever would generate more money would be good.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

It uses up so much money, where it could be used for more important things.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#10594



Tell us why:

Lowering the costs by \$300 million would be very beneficial.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support





#10594



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

Very Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Fairly Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water	Fairly Important



#10594



health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	Massey and Henderson needs better connections with the people and economy there, because it is still a relatively poor area with constant incidents happening due to bad economy and people's well-beings.

**Tell us why**

Could have some better choices.

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Stop waste water flowing into sea and closing beaches

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10604**



Stop wasting funds on pedestrian crossings that cost way too much for a simple bump in the road, get a fixed, competitive price for works

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

We need to get city moving and charge all users equitably, electric cars are still cars on the road!

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Speed cameras and variable speed limits, patrolling for cars with expired warrant and road user charges, there are loads in Hobsonville when out walking the area!

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

It's a great spot, Auckland needs a stadium close to transport to attract big events, this has bus and motorway access, just need parking around stadium to be developed and make this the. Ew Eden park or develop a harbour stadium next to britomart.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**



**#10604**



Good way to fill the void if spent sensibly

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

This is a blight on the waterfront, move the port and build a stadium to be proud of and stop wasting funds on Eden park

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#10604



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10604



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Very Important



#10604



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

All good initiatives to develop the region, maybe invest in one library rather than many smaller facilities though

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Seems reasonable

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**





**#10604**



Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Infrastructure needs to be improved, the main roads need to be improved, Highway 1 needs to be widened to four lanes in both directions, and three lanes in each area. The North Shore Tunnel needs to be built to join the railway rail transit, and reasonable charges can be made, otherwise it will not be able to meet the growing urban development. Basic facilities for hospitals and schools need to be improved, and high-



**#10633**



rise buildings and townhouses outside the central CBD need to be reduced, and high-density residential buildings should be planned in new urban areas or central business districts. If you want to develop the economy, you need to build roads. Basic common sense

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Reduce useless consultations, useless employees and departments. Executives should limit their annual salary and bonuses, conduct performance appraisals, cancel bonuses if they fail to meet the standards, improve the administrative effectiveness and efficiency of the city council, and cancel and merge departments with no performance. Make more use of AI and technology for management and analysis. Each department needs to hire multi-skilled, professionally-educated, competitive, hardworking and willing employees. Those who can only talk big and are lazy should be laid off. Control costs, especially infrastructure projects can be tendered to companies that have the ability to control costs and time, rather than garbage construction companies that delay construction all day and do nothing with taxpayers' money! Affecting traffic and the economy. We are willing to pay taxes for efficient development rather than paying for garbage infrastructure, delayed construction, and useless projects that are never fully budgeted.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cancel those useless bike lanes. It is entirely possible to build appropriate bike lanes in the suburbs of the city. The impact on the entire transportation system and commuting time should be evaluated. Bike lanes are not used at all, encroaching on the public transportation system and commuting time. In places where there is not enough space in the old city, what is needed is to improve the utilization rate of transportation facilities and systems, improve the utilization rate per unit area, and increase transportation capacity. Auckland's commuter traffic is getting worse and worse. What the hell is AT doing? Please get rid of those garbage who don't work, cancel the bureaucracy, and improve the streamlined system. Public transportation needs to improve the reasonable use of road routes, design efficient bus and rail transportation management. If it doesn't work, then global bidding should be conducted. Don't stand still and give opportunities to domestic construction companies



**#10633**



or management companies that have no ability and waste taxpayers' money. We need to control costs, reduce unnecessary expenses, and improve construction efficiency!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Education must be improved. Many high-density residential areas do not have enough infrastructure and schools and medical care. High-density residential areas with extremely poor planning are unreasonable developments!

Auckland's transportation is simply a negative example. More than 2 million people make it look like 20 million people. A section of road is repaired and repaired again and again. It takes several years to complete without any improvement. A few years later, it is widened again. It is a complete waste of time, money and commuting. Waste management and planning

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

What's the matter with reducing carbon emissions? People can't even eat.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The North Shore is becoming more and more developed. We need to keep and make good use of such stadiums instead of selling the land in a one-size-fits-all manner. Only brainless people sell land. We can sell the management rights and the council can take a cut to establish a joint management committee. Use advertising and more activities to increase revenue

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#10633**



**Tell us why:**

Keep part of it and sell part of the operating rights with a 10-year contract?

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The port should be moved

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

What is the model of the future fund? It is not transparent and unclear, and it is easy to be corrupt.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Maximize benefits and retain some equity. Have the right to make development suggestions

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#10633



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#10633



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

none

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities



#10633



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate**





**#10633**



following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

There must be accountability and performance appraisal should be established. Incompetent officials should be removed from their posts and their performance should be released to the public.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Set up Auckland Future Fund & which will enable our Commercial Port which brings us so much added value for the City

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10714**



Stop ALL speed bump installations and raised intersections. Reduce head count of council back office staff by 35% , reduce AT staffing by 70%, stop having libraries throw out good books (cut funding for new books by 50%)

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Stop ALL raised intersections and speed bumps. Start having AT work to a budget (you can create cycle ways for 30% of the cost they budget for....)

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

AT is wasting \$\$ on traffic management (road cones, lollipop operators) without any need for this.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Stop paying Eden Park., Council doesn't own it and due to neighbourhood objections it can't host concerts etc. Upgrade North Harbour Stadium to take over these functions.... North Shore Stadium did well under prior management - current management clearly incompetent (or go with a government paid stadium in the Wynyard quarter)

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#10714**



**Tell us why:**

Auckland needs a working container port. A long term lease or a 49% share market float would see rate payers get a much better return on investment.

Auckland does not need to own Airport Shares and would get a much better return on investment through investing in infrastructure

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Auckland NEEDS a cost effective productive commercial port for the city to flourish.  
Either offer a long term lease OR SELL 49% IN SHAREMARKET FLOAT

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#10714



Auckland City not only needs a functioning container port - it gains hugely from tourism and cruise boat visits. The Captain Cook and Marsden wharves need to be extended (or dolphins fitted) and developed with immigration terminals etc as luxury Cruise bo

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support



#10714



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I don't know



#10714



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate**



**#10714**



following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Sell part of the Unsworth Reserve - originally planned by Ministry of Education for primary school back to the ministry for this purpose.....as local schools now overloaded and zones reduced

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Why do you repeatedly upgrade perfectly functional beautiful playgrounds by ripping out 100% of the existing when a 10% improvement would suffice?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Road infrastructure. Improve AT.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#10825**



Events.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#10825



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#10825



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10825



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important



#10825



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Hobsonville Community Trust

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1) Increase funding of community emergency preparedness work directly to community emergency response groups/hubs/shelters to enable sufficient training, resourcing and equipping of these as they are your critical frontline, as proved by the Auckland Floods, yet are massively under-resourced/equipped



**#10834**



2) Increase funding of community facilities, community groups and development of new community facilities in new community developments as these maximise the use of funding, do not waste spending, and multiply investment through their volunteers and networks.

3) Protect and invest in access to our water in Hobsonville by taking ownership of the Catalina Bay Boat Ramp before Kaianga Ora demolish it

4) Increase dedicated financial provision for community facilities for new large housing areas by introducing a 'community provision levy' - the current levies are being sucked up by other infrastructure and community is missing out.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Reduce ridiculous pricing that Council pays for its preferred suppliers and contractors. Require much higher, more efficient standard of delivery by facility contractors such as Ventia and get a better deal for council. There's so much wastage it's infuriating when community organizations like us have to be careful with every penny and we could do the same for so much cheaper either ourselves or through normal contractors.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The government removing the children AT subsidy is a deterrent to using public transport and hurts those that are struggling most.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Local Boards usually know community best so retain investment in local board initiatives.

Invest in transport in growth areas otherwise we are simply encouraging more cars and needing to invest in more roads

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**





**#10834**



**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Clearly the current management has not been able to maximise use of this great asset. The asset needs to be managed by community for community so that motivation is strong for strong positive outcomes and so that it is maximised in its day to day use by community sport. There is a huge lack of indoor and outdoor sport space so surely this could be redeveloped to meet these needs while retaining some ability to maintain some professional sporting code needs that can't be met by larger stadiums

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#10834



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10834



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour



#10834



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

It is critical to invest in key community infrastructure and quality open space in areas impacted by growth and intensification. Operating spend also needs to be grown to



**#10834**



reflect these growing areas and the community organisations and community facilities that services these areas.

Whenuapai needs a new community centre given its projected population growth and not just a public toilet facility.

We believe that the Upper Harbour Board needs to urgently investigate and advocate strongly for the retention of the Catalina Bay Boat Ramp for both water access and historic purposes and that this asset should be sought to be moved from Kaianga Ora to Auckland Council ownership so that it can be maintained in its current condition. This ramp will be crucial in complementing the new Marine Centre and it's wharf.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Why not incorporate this into the Albany Stadium re-development?

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Support communities more at grass root, community organisation level. They are so much more efficient and effective than council.

Support directly community emergency response groups and organisations as they can't operate and be sustainable long-term without ongoing resourcing and funding



**#10856**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop paying ridiculous redundancy payments and excessive wages at senior levels when community leaders are working just as hard for not even a quarter of what they are being paid yet are struggling for funding.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport, especially in new or rapidly growing communiites

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Repurpose back to being grassroots community facility, incorporate new albany library into it + increase indoor sports facility space that is lacking across the region.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



**#10856**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**





#10856



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#10856



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important



#10856



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Support these but emphasise the need to invest in Whenuapai community facilities and community and environmental organisations on the ground who are most effective with multiplying the value of investment.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate



**#10856**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

North Harbour Stadium would seem like a sensible fit for this and surely be a win-win at much lower cost than purchasing other land. Car parking would already be available and other community sport indoor/outdoor facilities could be developed to maximise

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Over the last few years, especially under the last government, there was excessive focus on diversity, equality and inclusiveness to the extent that it was having the opposite effect of more social divisiveness. My understanding is that people in



**#10921**



government, both local and central, would be surprised by the percentage of people who would rather that you reduce spending there and instead focus on creating a brighter future through focusing on the younger generation.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Traffic lights around schools instead of relying on vehicles to stop for kids crossing to reach school.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#10921**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

In this case, it is likely a bird in hand is better than two in the bush.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#10921



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>





#10921



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#10926**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport cuts down on traffic problems. Walkways and bike lanes are used by very few people.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

It's important to have the stadium for games. It should be used far more for concerts and community events.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#10926



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Do not support



#10926



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other



#10926



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important



#10926



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Fairly Important

### Tell us why

#### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Leave the stadium as it is.

#### 7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

#### Which of the following options do you support?

None of the above

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

#### 8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

We're willing to pay more to:

- fight neighborhood crime
- support for at-risk youth who are exposed to crime lifestyle





**#10946**



- attract international/tech businesses to establish presence and hire in Auckland
- work towards the 'predator free 2050' goal

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

- the current pool fence regulation (overly strict, every 3 years) costs home owners tens of thousands of dollars that could be used for way more important things. Can change to charge a certain annual fee for all pool owners.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Agree with the 'Stopping previously-planned initiatives' one.

More than \$1B/year is a lot of money to invest. Consider increase more hubs and more reach to encourage more people take the bus. Payment method is a minor thing to improve.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Extend bus (even less frequent) to more rural areas like Paremoremo;

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



**#10946**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Auckland Council should focus on using their tax-payers money wisely to serve the people, rather than being a shareholder to invest in other businesses and make money. Doesn't sound like a good use of tax money.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I do not support Auckland Future Fund at all. See answer to 4a.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I do not support Auckland Future Fund at all. See answer to 4a.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I do not support Auckland Future Fund at all. See answer to 4a.



#10946



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10946



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour



#10946



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I like the environmental focused priorities since climate change is happening faster than we think.



**#10946**



**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Why can't we utilize the library better and fund it with charges and donations - I would happily donate a good portion of money we spent on building the \$10k+ pool fence for a gated property with no kids to the library.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Should fund more for neighborhood safety (against crime).



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

- Neighborhood crime prevention
- Gang reduction
- At-risk youth



**#10964**



- Attracting more international businesses in Auckland and hiring
- Less Traffic (wasn't sold current transportation will help this)

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

- Get rid of the pool fence regulation, spent over 10k on my property alone which could be used for way more important initiatives
- Transport. It does not have a great plan to address terrible Auckland traffic.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This proposal does not clearly communicate how it will address solving the terrible traffic problems of Auckland.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Invest in infrastructure and roads to reduce traffic and forecast time saved for transit. Invest in a plan to scale more hubs in the greater Auckland area for micro economies to grow to spread out the population and congestion.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Making it easier to pay for rapid transit and capping weekly public transport passes seem to be of very low priority in addressing Auckland's horrendous traffic problem.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**





**#10964**



The stadium is not contributing to the growth of Albany or Auckland's greater area. Instead, the land should be used to attract new businesses, real estate, or other community services that will accelerate economic growth.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It is not clear why the council's major investments are at risk and what the council plans to diversify into with the "Auckland Future Fund." The proposal seems to be only surface-level and raises serious concerns. Additionally, accessing the fund through a trust is bound to cause government gridlock when making a unified decision on accessing and liquidating the funds in the future.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

This proposal is unreasonable as it heavily relies on 4a and the Auckland Future Fund. It's unclear why leasing has to benefit the Auckland Future Fund exclusively. Instead, the 1.2 billion upfront payment could be allocated towards addressing numerous pressing issues in other areas.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**



#10964



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I disagree with the proposal and believe we should wait for a better plan supported by data on how it will benefit Auckland citizens.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Agreed as long as it is used for new public spaces and/or new waterfront residential or commercial developments.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

I fully support initiatives that create new public spaces and accelerate economic growth in Auckland's Port Land for commercial use.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#10964



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#10964



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna, Upper Harbour

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	Not Important
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important



#10964



Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Fairly Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I would like to see more on the budget that includes helping accelerate commercial growth for businesses to expand in the Takapuna area to accelerate economic growth and attraction of more talent, tourists, artists, etc.

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Very Important



#10964



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

We don't need a library, the current one is not even utilized much and there's plenty already across Auckland. Instead, we need to accelerate development and implementation of a plan for Albany where people want to live, visit, shop, work and connect. A

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I think the library is way too high on the priority list, and it's concerning that it is higher in priority than a lot of the other priorities on the list, specifically attracting people to visit and live, addressing the stadium, infrastructure improvements to name a few.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above



**#10964**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

We don't need a multi-purpose library. Libraries are significantly underutilized by the public and are not a future-thinking investment.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improved public transport options and improved access for pedestrians and cyclists

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#10977**



Less roads solely for motor vehicles

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

There is an urgent need to improve public transport options but there is also a urgent need for improved access for cycling and walking to connect communities. I am strongly opposed to stopping the extension of cycle ways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport. Introduce congestion charges.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Motorways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#10977**



I believe it is a short term solution to the major infrastructure and social problems in Auckland.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I believe it is the better long-term option

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#10977



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know



#10977



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Fairly Important



#10977



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate



**#10977**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



#10988



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Use a congestion tax to reduce traffic at peak times.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Electric busses and cycle ways if they are safe for users

Improve the rds we already have, that are currently unsafe....pot holes etc

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

building new rds

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The previous operational management had it running successfully with community events and community involvement. Albany area and the North shore are high density now and need big stadiums like this for R & R as many high density homes do not have enough backyard for kids to play in.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The AIAL shareholding is a strategic asset that allows ACC to have some say on future developments. AIAL shares shouldn't be treated as just another investment.





**#10988**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

These are a public asset and will provide a pathway to the sea for AK city

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#10988



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#10988



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#10988



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Libraries are a valuable asset to the community engaging folk of many different cultures and beliefs. For new to NZ families, Libraries are an important tool for them to meet their local community in a relaxed non threatening and supportive environment. L

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate



**#10988**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

I am concerned that if land is to be sold the profits may not all go into the Library rebuild. Also what land have we got to sell??

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Upper Harbour Youth Council

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#11022**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#11022



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	





#11022



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour



#11022



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

#### Tell us why

We value improving education and accessibility for everyone in the region.

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#11022**



**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Maybe build a diversified fund like the Auckland Council is doing

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Any international trips to participate in forums, see how things work elsewhere; we have Augmented Reality and there is enough content on YouTube to show us how



**#11130**



much better other world-leading cities do things. As well, participating through Zoom is good enough for the near-term for almost all international forums or sister-city activities, and use all of those funds instead to help deliver elevated monorail from the airport to Albany, connecting to the existing train system at Onehunga & Mt. Eden.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Do not support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

We must roll out more T3 lanes, legislate that employers over 50 employees actively encourage carpool options (includes scheduling considerations) and all employers of over 200 people have every tax-recoverable public transport supporting mechanism in place, including e-bike tax credits through employers etc. Raised pedestrian crossings are a must-have for safety of differently-abled, vulnerable, and very young/old pedestrians, and should be more proactively rolled out. Separated cycle & scooter lanes are also a must, and should be partially funded from healthcare funding, to interrupt cycles of obesity etc (much) sooner. On-street parking along strategic arterials should be greatly reduced, allowing much more free-flowing traffic from 6am-7pm. Again, reducing road-widening and any new road creation to instead install raised monorail from the airport to albany, with feeder loops of cable cars like Paris, Portland, Bogota, La Paz, Singapore, Disney World, and plenty more.

As well, there need to be public-private partnership parking decks (using Swiss auto-park systems to get 30-40% more space out of decks, instead of letting people park themselves) at Pukekohe, Paerata, Drury, Takaanini, Manukau, Papatoetoe, Onehunga, Swanson, Ranui, Henderson train stations plus Albany, Rosedale, Constellation Drive, Smales Farm express bus stops.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Raised pedestrian crossings are a must-have for safety of differently-abled, vulnerable, and very young/old pedestrians, and should be more proactively rolled out. Separated cycle & scooter lanes are also a must, and should be partially funded from healthcare funding, to interrupt cycles of obesity etc (much) sooner. Again, reducing road-widening and any new road creation to instead install raised monorail from the airport to albany, with feeder loops of cable cars like Paris, Portland, Bogota, La Paz, Singapore, Disney World, and plenty more.



**#11130**



**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Any brand new roads, chip seal (which should be completely abandoned and replaced with either concrete roads or proper asphalt).

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Having conducted events from the states, to Uganda, and across New Zealand, the current structure is seriously deficient and needs to have active community members with various levels of direct industry experience, as well as several "outlier" visionary people. It needs to be earthquake strengthened, and have multi-modal uses employed to generate an income, including cladding it with solar panels to sell energy to the grid for a start.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Most major states/cities already have this sort of thing, and again we are so far behind in playing catch-up in this sort of thing. It should also be financed by something like a NZ\$5 tourist fee collected from all international boat and plane tourists into AKL, with a \$1 domestic fee, to ensure that current tourism helps ensure the city meets their current needs and is able to build for future tourists.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other



**#11130**



**Tell us here:**

Move all Port operations out of their current location and to someplace with direct, port-only rail and highway connections, even if it means selling the whole port operations and investing that into the AFF. It would need to move to someplace with the least combined volcanic, tsunami, and earthquake risk, even if it meant laying new rail tracks to service it.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Continue to use it to fund council services while implementing a weight-ratioed fee for every container/vehicle shipped through the port to support the AFF.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

We need to move port operations out of the CBD as fast as possible and enable rapid development of public-centric development, some of which costs nothing and is available 24/7/365 in nearly any weather to enjoy (but not for unhomed people to take up resi

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#11130



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Again, we need to move port operations out of the CBD as fast as possible and enable rapid development of public-centric development, some of which costs nothing and is available 24/7/365 in nearly any weather to enjoy (but not for unhomed people to take up residence in).

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support





#11130



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Council should also require Watercare to immediately start installing "Lucid" pipes (freshwater pipes with turbines in them that generate localized power to be sold into the grid) in every project possible to subsidize the costs of water projects.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays, Kaipātiki, Upper Harbour

**Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#11130



Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support all priorities

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

Very Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#11130



Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	Very Important
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	Very Important
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	Very Important
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	Very Important
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	

**Tell us why**

Agree overall, but Long Bay Regional Park and it's beach needs serious investment as well.

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



#11130



## Howick Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	

Tell us why



#11130



7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I support all priorities

Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?

Very Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Very Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Very Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Very Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Very Important



#11130



Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Very Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	

**Tell us why**

Overall agree, however, Wairau Valley flooding works needed to have started 12 months ago. Buy out the sections closest to the highway (from Continental Cars to BP, and across Tristram Ave from Living Culture Showroom to North Harbour Ford up to Rebel Spo

**7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate	Very Important



#11130



change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Partner with local groups such as Abilities Group and a recycle/repair/reuse hub to fund an all-in-one center that includes not just a library but also on-site, 6-days/week repair spaces, a tool library for the North Shore (branch of Auckland Library of Tools?), Hack/Makerspaces, etc., which would all contribute to the potential funding routes (grants from various organizations) etc.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#11130**



Partner with local groups such as Abilities Group and a recycle/repair/reuse hub to fund an all-in-one center that includes not just a library but also on-site, 6-days/week repair spaces, a tool library for the North Shore (branch of Auckland Library of T

#### **8. Do you have any other comments?**

Council needs an easier route for "outlier" visionary people who have the minds, ideas, and gut to stand up and offer "radical" ideas for better managing, using, governing, and driving healthier all-around outcomes (physically, mentally, emotionally, financially, all of it) to be heard, because to simply submit through the People's Panel or these type surveys and then have their ideas removed as "too broad spectrum" or "not within scope" but actually solve many issues at once is not actually letting them get voiced.

As well, drone-enforcement options to speed up active recording/documentation of situations, such as a loud party, or illegally parked vehicles should be explored to reduce staffing & individual vehicle costs, while greatly expanding how many incidents can be rapidly/concurrently attended.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I'm not quite sure at the moment

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

I'm not sure



#11149



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I feel that it is good to make public transport more reliable as it helps get cars off the road and means there will be fewer cancellations I'm not as invested in network optimization however as that is not my first thought about things to improve in New Zealand and I rather some previously planned initiatives go ahead as some of these projects likely already have money invested in them and it will be waste

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

If anything I would think more frequent buses

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Network optimisation

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Other

### Tell us why:

I feel that redeveloping the stadium would be a good thing however by redeveloping it you're allocating the funds for maintenance over the next decade. What about maintaining the redeveloped stadium once it's built over the next decade would it similar amount or much less

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal



**#11149**



**Tell us why:**

I feel that this may be beneficial as we never know what could happen even further in the future that we aren't really prepared to face.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I am not sure.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I feel that this fund will be beneficial in the future.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No, I don't.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I feel that funds could be put towards something else, and this could be done further in the future.



#11149



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

I feel that it may not be worth reducing the scale of port operations

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Other



#11149



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

I don't have any feedback.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#11149



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

The reason for these answers is that with some of these plans, I'm not that sure what they plan to do exactly.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I'm rather unsure, But I think it's good that action is being taken on some things

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**



**#11149**



**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

I'm unsure, But I think selling land would be good, maybe selling it out for commercial purposes ?

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

rock climbing gym

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no





**#11154**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

idk

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

i dont care

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#11154**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

idk

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

i dont know

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

nah

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#11154



idk

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#11154



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

no

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey, Upper Harbour

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

Very Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Very Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low	Very Important



#11154



carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Fairly Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Fairly Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	people and nature first

**Tell us why**

good

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#11154



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

idk

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

good

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#11154**



no

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

rock climbing gym

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no





**#11158**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

idk

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

its good

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#11158**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

idk

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

i cant invest

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

no

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

idk



#11158



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#11158



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#11199**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#11199



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#11199



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>





#11199



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Kaipātiki, Upper Harbour

### Howick Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	



#11199



<p>Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.</p>	
--	--

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support all priorities

**Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

<p>Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.</p>	<p>Very Important</p>
---	-----------------------



#11199



Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Fairly Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Fairly Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Fairly Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Not Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#11199



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

### Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#11199**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#11212**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#11212



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>I don't know</p>





#11212



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#11212



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey, Upper Harbour, Waitākere Ranges

### Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

Not Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Fairly Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Not Important
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	I don't know
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

Tell us why



#11212



7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

Tell us why



#11212



7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

I don't know

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

## Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	I do not support most priorities
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	Not Important
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	Fairly Important



#11212



Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	Very Important
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	Not Important
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	Not Important
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	Not Important
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	Not Important
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Fairly Important

**7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#11221**



Become more efficient with contracting projects. Seems once it is a council project costs escalate.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It is needed.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways and raised pedestrian crossings.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

DO NOT demolish stadium building. Maybe it could be altered to be more fit for purpose. Reinstate stand that was removed for baseball which was always going to be a disaster. Maybe then sporting commercial and community groups would use it. Put back into community/trust management as AK unlimited have not marketed the great facility or maintained it so are quite clearly unable to manage the facility - maybe this has been deliberate. NO land sales of the precinct.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#11221**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Do not agree with sale of airport shares.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Lease for 35 years is far too long.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Seems to be most efficient and money is needed for council services.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**





#11221



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#11221



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
--	------------------



#11221



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Think the basics should be carried out not other non essential things.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Some are ok some are nice to have but not needed.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#11221**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Maybe it is best to lease a building not build, given council finances.

I DO NOT SUPPORT a targeted rate to build a library as this will impact rates for many years.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively.



**#11252**



- Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.
- We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per Surf Lifesaving Northern Region's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.
- Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club has existed in its current location for 70 years. The current membership comprises ~150 active lifeguards, over 500 Junior Surf children aged 6-14yrs and a further ~600 associate members. The building is well past its useful life and can no longer adequately cater for its membership and activities. A new building is therefore imperative to continue being able to serve the membership and community.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



#11252



Tell us why:

4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	
---	--



#11252



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	





#11252



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

· With regard to Question 1c, Auckland Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle. Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club volunteers rescued over 70 people in the Auckland Anniversary floods and did so operating out of storage shipping containers.

· Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our



#11252



community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	"Finalising the review of the 2015 Mairangi Bay Reserve Management plan and supporting the Mairangi Bay Surf Lifesaving Club to progress its redevelopment project is imperative for the upcoming year."

**Tell us why**

It should be a priority to deliver the Mairangi Bay Reserve Management Plan outcomes within the 10 year period, including a new surf lifesaving club building and associated storage, road closure and seawall maintenance."

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#11252**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#11270



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#11270



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

## AK HAVE YOUR SAY

### Long-term Plan 2024-2034 Submission Form

First and last name: [REDACTED], Chair Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust

Email or postal address: [REDACTED]

Local Board or suburb: Upper Harbour

<https://www.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/about-auckland-council/how-auckland-council-works/local-boards/Pages/find-local-board.aspx>

Name of organisation: Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust

The Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust (HHCT) is a charitable organisation and is the leaseholder with the Auckland Council, responsible for the National Hockey Centre (NHC) in Bush Road, Albany. The HHCT licences the facility to the North Harbour Hockey Association (NHHA).

The NHHA is an Incorporated Society and Regional Sports Organisation with responsibility to deliver and enable hockey competitions and programmes at all levels of the sport for approximately 94 schools and 10 clubs across the whole of the North Harbour region. In addition, it is the main training base for the national high-performance programme, when assembled, and is configured to be able to deliver Tier-1 international hockey events.

Together the HHCT and NHHA cooperate to promote and deliver world-class opportunities in the community through hockey. It also has a commercial imperative to run the NHC as a community space, and corporate venue, while administering hockey programmes, and competitions sustainably and efficiently to benefit its members and the wider community, including for those in need.

Specifically, the HHCT is responsible for the capital maintenance and future capital replacement of the NHC.

#### **Our submission**

We wish to make the following submission to the Auckland Council Long-term Plan 2024-2034 consultation.

We are part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland.

Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council's support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

**Tell us here:**



We submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

We submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

We submit that the Central proposal for Economic and cultural development, and in particular the initiative to reinstate major events and economic development funding to pre COVID-19 levels will be critical in the success of facility owners and RSO's like us. The funding will allow us to compete to bring significant national and international events to Auckland attracting out of town visitors to invest in the Auckland economy.

A domestic example being the National Masters Hockey Tournament which now comprises in excess of 100 teams and nearly 2000 players and management over an 8-day period (around 8000 hotel nights). This has not been held in Auckland for several years due to the financial support provided by Councils in other regional and urban centres, which is not available in Auckland.

We submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

We **support** the following aspects of the consultation:

- We support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- We propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- We propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.
- We advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- We support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- We support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- We advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.

## How to submit this form

**Email** – Email your completed form to [akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz](mailto:akhaveyoursay@aucklandcouncil.govt.nz)

**In person** - Drop your completed form off at your local library or service centre.

**By post** - Place your completed form in an envelope and send it to freepost address:

AK Have Your say  
Auckland Council,

Freepost Authority 182382  
Private Bag 92300  
Auckland 1142

Note: Your feedback will be included in public documents. All other personal details will remain private.

This submission can also be done online if you prefer:

<https://akhaveyoursay.aucklandcouncil.govt.nz/hub-page/long-term-plan-2024-2034>



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Not sure



**#11277**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I don't want to spend more money on transport, but it would be nice not to wait as long for the next bus.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Yes, but not sure yet

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

I don't really see a problem with how it is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Don't know



**#11277**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Don't know

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Don't know

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I think It's fine to leave it how it is

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#11277



Not sure

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#11277



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	I don't know



#11277



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I don't know

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I don't know

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**





**#11277**



I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

No

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop building raised pedestrian crossings.



**#11285**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More public transport options

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium seems to be under-utilised. Spaces could be redeveloped for multi-use options so we get better value from the space..

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I suspect the fund may not be used for the best things.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#11285



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#11285



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#11285



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Very Important



#11285



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

sound good

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

The library is a very busy community facility and its important to move plans ahead on a new venue.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

A blue-green spatial network plan for all newly developing area in the city to link waterways and green spaces with walking and cycling paths. Better integrated public transport





**#11301**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Be more efficient internally and put a 3 year freeze on council staff earning over \$100,000.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree with all that is being proposed except stopping development of further cycleways

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Better ferry services.

Bus lane and park and ride facilities on the North-western motorway.

Rapid rail system out to Auckland Airport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The organization of Auckland Transport itself. It does not need to be there at all. There is too much duplication of costs and lack of accountability

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This stadium was built by local north shore residents and it is an asset that should be retained for the people forever. Get better operational staff for it to run it more efficiently and hold more events there.



**#11301**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Auckland airport is a revenue earning asset that belong to future generations. We have not right to sell it away from future citizens of the city just because times are a bit tough. Auckland is a growing city and our airport will prove to be an even more valuable asset and revenue earner over time.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The upfront payment will help fund some of Auckland much needed transport infrastructure.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The future fund should be used for future capital growth project of the city

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#11301



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This is an opportunity to use this land to provide some excellent public spaces and amenities for the Auckland public on the waterfront and to start to make it more attractive.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

We should not have large containers on trucks driving through the inner city. Again more space for public amenities and possible tourist features when cruise ships come into Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#11301



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No feedback



#11301



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know



**#11301**



### Tell us why

I do not know what the UH Engagement strategy is, nor the UH Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment is.

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I would like to know what the Local Board Transport Capital Fund. with the plans to continue to build thousands of houses in this area of the next few years we need some proper public transport.

I very much agree that appropriate planning and investment for infrastructure and quality open space in areas impacted by growth and intensification e.g., Whenuapai, Hobsonville Point are incredibly important.

### 7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

### Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land

### Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

Don't sell assets

### 8. Do you have any other comments?

Councils 10 year plan should ultimately be about the people and the environment and to preserve the city's assets for future generations.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

None

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

None



**#11357**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I do not support the stopping of building the raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

None

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

None

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

In order to better deliver for the needs of the North Shore community while still maintaining the existing community playing fields.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

In order to have a budget for Auckland's future, be prepared for climate change, and invest in different assets to spread the risk and diversify.





**#11357**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

In order to have more revenue without increasing the rates or cutting council services.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

In order to have more funds for different assets while diversifying, and to better prepare for Auckland's future, and particularly climate change.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

None

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Because the wharves aren't used that much and is used mostly for just parking space. If the Captain Cook and Marsden wharves get transferred to Auckland Council, they can be used for something more productive and more beneficial for the public.



#11357



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Because it would significantly reduce the port operations in Auckland, resulting in having a hard time to adjust to the sudden increase in road/rail transport due to more shipments transported by trucks or rails, which will result in more traffic and less use for sea transport. It would also reduce the future profits and dividends for the Auckland Council.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#11357



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

None

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**



#11357



I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Because I think that investing and focusing in environmental projects should be prioritized in order to help prevent climate change. The other priorities are still fairly important in my opinion.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

They are great priorities for the budget and I think they should be followed through.



**#11357**



**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

None

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

None



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#11359**



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

not sure what dynamic lanes will bring

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#11359



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>





#11359



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Other
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#11359**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Parks maintenance and cleaning. More rubbish bins in parks and public areas.

Oppose fortnightly rubbish collections, keep status quo

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#11399**



Less boat marinas, less bike way bollards, developing houses in areas which can't be serviced by infrastructure and adding to congestion.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Agree with doing less with traffic management and cones

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More frequent ferries for hobsonville.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#11399



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#11399



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#11399



Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Fairly Important



#11399



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More parks maintenance and cleaning. More rubbish bins in parks. Oppose fortnightly waste collection, keep as weekly collection. More separated cyclelanes.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#11400**



Less boat mooring/marina, only rich people benefit from them. Developing more housing in areas that can't be serviced, adding to traffic jams.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Still want cycle lanes. Agree with reducing traffic management and cones, and making better use of existing infrastructure.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

More frequent ferries for Hobsonville Point. More cycle lanes. Improve transport for northwest.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Speed reduction initiatives.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#11400**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#11400



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#11400



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#11400



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Do not new facility in Albany.



**#11400**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NO

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

NO





**#11407**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Making public transport faster and capping passes. Stopping raised crossings and cycle lanes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

As above, raised crossings and cycle lanes!

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It is the only stadium on the North Shore, under the previous management it held various events and is home to North Harbour rugby, I buy a season pass to the lounge every year. Worst idea ever to chop some of the grandstand away for baseball. Now the team has gone bust! Complete waste of money

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#11407**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#11407



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#11407



<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Help develop sporting facilities and access to water, improve maintenance of community parks and open spaces, improve infrastructure and ensure swimmable water. Dedicated priority bus lanes to encourage use.



**#11415**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Creating priority bus lanes wherever possible to encourage use and ensure children aren't sitting in traffic instead of being at school. Especially Upper Harbour Drive.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

This area should be redeveloped as a sporting hub. A new 50m pool at Albany stadium (as originally proposed) to improve supply of lane swimming for recreational use should be considered. Also consider installing purpose built canoe polo courts, similar to those at the Mitre 10 Sports Park in Hawke's Bay (<http://www.canoepolohb.co.nz/CanoePoloAquaticFacility>). Auckland is poorly served in this area and growth and development is severely hampered due to a lack of suitable regional facilities. The canoe polo courts can be used for irrigation of greater sports fields.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#11415**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Allows more flexibility for future changes.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#11415



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support





#11415



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Devonport-Takapuna

## Devonport-Takapuna Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Devonport-Takapuna in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?



#11415



Progress the detailed business case and delivery of a new library and community hub in Takapuna.	I don't know
Complete the Devonport-Takapuna Local Parks Management Plan that will guide decisions on the use and management of our parks and open spaces.	Fairly Important
Implement priority actions from the Devonport Takapuna Ethnic Plan.	I don't know
Continue to build relationships with Iwi and Mataawaka to promote projects of interest to Māori including the restoration and improvement of Te Uru Tapu.	Fairly Important
Invest in the delivery of key events in our town centres to support local businesses and showcase our area to visitors and locals alike.	Very Important
Continue to renew and improve community facilities including the playground at Achilles Reserve and toilets and changing facilities at Becroft Park.	Very Important
Continue support of our valued art partners who provide a wide range of programmes, exhibitions and live productions and performances.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Devonport-Takapuna proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

The Devonport-Takapuna Local Board should consider supporting the North Shore Canoe Club and Auckland Canoe Polo in their vision to make the area on Northcote Road by Quarry Lake and Lake Pupuke a paddle sports centre of excellence by supporting water sports infrastructure, water quality monitoring and management,



**#11415**



safety and landscaping improvements to help make this an area of significant recreational value.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

N/A

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



#11436



N/A

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need investment in our transport system now more than ever as the city grows and we face challenges having a car centric society. Further investment in public transportation will also assist the city in meeting its climate goals and reducing its carbon emissions

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Opening a portion of the precinct land for development is a great idea especially in the context that it is in close proximity to the Albany bus station.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Its a good investment. from what i remember from last years consultation document, the 11% share doesn't afford council much power when voting on AIAL decisions



**#11436**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No comment

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

This would enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront area and would build on the improvements already made along the ferry terminal area.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#11436



**Tell us why:**

This would enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront area and would build on the improvements already made along the ferry terminal area.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing</p>	<p>Support</p>



#11436



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

No comment

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?





#11436



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

we need to invest in our communities and our people and enhance their spaces and provide for their amenity

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

No comment

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell**



**#11436**



land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

No comment

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

No comment



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Reduce grid lock and congestion

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Traffic management we don't need that many cones around.



**#11439**



No more investment in cycle ways.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need more reliable and frequent public transport services with lower cost so that people would commute using public transport.

No more investment in cycle ways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Expenses for independent audits for CCOs. CCOs needs to be benchmarked against similar privately owned organizations in terms of productivity.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#11439



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#11439



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	



#11439



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I support. The CCOs need to be held accountable.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#11463



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#11463



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Do not support



**#11463**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better environment; including supporting education on use of urban natural reserves and more maintenance of parks and gardens. Clear and bring alive waterways and ponds.



#11470



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop funding "economic" bodies such as ATEED which are a waste of rates as central government should provide support and the drivers for economic development. Auckland is the country's economic engine, so why should we pay twice for economic and business development? But, I'd still like Council to support cultural events such as the Auckland Arts festival etc. Also NOT keen on the Auckland Future Fund - it is just asset stripping. The AIAL shares will continue to pay a dividend.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Recent bus fare rises are already making bus travel to the city less economic and having people pay for park and ride parking will encourage people to return to using their cars to drive into the city for work. Also, can never see the point of "time-of-use" charging for transport services. We all have to work an 8 hour day, so cannot easily change start and end hours. This type of charging is just another type of tax on the everyday worker.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Building better trains infrastructure

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road "furniture" such as speed bumps and placing a traffic light on every corner

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



**#11470**



This is a beautiful stadium. It is very poorly managed and promoted. DO NOT strip this asset. Use this more often, as was planned,

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The AIAL shares will continue to pay a dividend. This is an asset stripping proposal/strategy. This has been proven as an old , 1990s strategy that only ultimately impoverishes the council.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Leasing rail infrastructure to Kiwi rail has not been a great success. They have taken the earnings off-shore and we are left with a weaker train system as they have not re-invested in new infrastructure. Why do the same with Auckland's port?

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I dont like the Auckland Future Fund.





#11470



**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Having stripped out Auckland's revenue earning investments, (sold the airport shares and given away future earnings due to a 35 year lease on the port)there will be no other option than to keep putting up rates at an even faster rate.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I dont see how this is going to make a difference to Public access to the harbour. What kind of access for who? Super yachts and their owners?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Why close part of an important piece of infrastructure for our city? Why would the public want to have goods trucked in from Tuaranga (for example). This is not a good plan for the public as they will have to pay more for the goods due to trucking costs and then also have to deal with congestion on the motorway to Tauranga. This is not very green, nor does it support initiative to reduce emissions.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
---	----------------



#11470



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#11470**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make Auckland a proper modern city by concentrating on public transportation, not building more roads for more cars to clog up.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public Transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#11471



**Tell us here:**

The current policy of "selling off the family silver" is unsustainable, selling off public waterfront land to private interests is immoral.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#11471



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#11471



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

By operating CCOs council is reneging on its responsibility to manage the city. They should be disestablished, and the first to go should be Eke Panuku.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Funding services that should be provided by central government



**#11524**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Implementing reduced bus services along with a toll for high usage times doesn't make sense. A toll will encourage people to take buses, but that will just add even more frustration to a bus system that is already reduced.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

If the stadium isn't being utilised, then get rid of it. Stop spending on maintenance and pull it down. Keep the practice fields, but sell the rest, or better yet build a council run home for seniors.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:

If we have a current funding crisis and can't fund things that need to be done now why funnel off some of those funds to future I don't know what but we'll need it someday' plans.



#11524



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Short term gain (by leasing /selling) will only create long term pain when that funding is gone and nothing available for the future. Keep what existing revenue streams you can.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

We need the funding now! Who knows what the future will hold.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Just - why? Why decrease the port's capability and add to transport costs that will be passed on to consumers?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#11524



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#11524



<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#11529**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#11529



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in</p>	<p>Support</p>





#11529



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#11529



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important



#11529



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour  
Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Treat all nationalities the same no extra for 1 cultural group

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less or no free transport to special large events



**#11578**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Good transport keeps everyone getting where they need to go

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Community connections & small events connecting people in there own suburbs

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Promoting Maori names or advertising. Tourists & all NZ cultures are important.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is,Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Stadium with growth in North Auckland & Northland could be needed in future. Once gone hard to replace

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Airport is always going to be there & expanding. If shareholding is not generating yearly good income. Use money on core services of council.



**#11578**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Council is there to provide services to rate payers not run businesses

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Developing connected communities

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

City is not attractive unless it has community & pleasant atmosphere & areas

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#11578



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#11578



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Fairly Important





#11578



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land



**#11578**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Libraries need to be functional & very well used every suburb does not need a library building. online is future of libraries

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Repair, seal and upgrade our roads, this is of vital importance to people’s safety. It’s tragic how many deaths or damage we get from poor conditioned roads.

P



**#11593**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

arts and culture, fun activities sport entertainment and events are things that people enjoy however they don't necessarily provide value improvements to businesses and at this time.

Less red tape = less expense for council and public. Review and simplify processes to strike a balance between quality and excessive time. Allow people to build houses (resource and building consents) easier and cheaper and spend less time which means less money

Re-evaluate things that are the most important or critical. All of New Zealand is trying to cut costs during rising prices wherever possible and we expect council to do the same.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

We need to end up with public transport like Australia or other cities around the world and make it desirable for everyone to use.

The problem is that Auckland is so spread out and the amount of busses driving around empty once an hour makes things difficult for people to get where they want to go without spending hours so they have to drive.

We need to build central hubs like park and rides throughout the city and basically feed the city from these. Even if parking was charged I think that would be good.

The northern busway works well in peak times with busses every 3 minutes, but it could take 30 minutes to get there via a bus or wait 30 minutes for a bus to get to each station.

Aim to build something like 100 park and rides across Auckland with 100,000 spaces (1000 spaces per p&r) then have busses or trains every few minutes.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Infrastructure like park and rides to give people convenient access to feeder stations.



**#11593**



Smart Technology to improve traffic light phasing for cars, smart detection of vehicles using Bluetooth, sonar, zigbee, google or Apple maps do traffic detection and smart car integrations for up to date traffic alerts straight to ATOC operators so they can on the fly make changes to traffic light systems to handle fringe cases and direct traffic accordingly.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

I'm sure there are cost savings somewhere.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Redevelop it into something for events and

Host more events with local promoters to bring the people and keep it going.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Lease it and get some more money then spend it wisely.



#11593



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#11593



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Other</p>



#11593



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important





#11593



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

As great as it would be I don't think we can afford this.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#11656**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#11656



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#11656



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more money towards schools

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**#11690**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

cause there's so much traffic

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

nope

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

nope

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

not to sure

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

it would be good

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#11690**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

not sure

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**





#11690



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#11690



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

no

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Henderson-Massey

### Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?

Very Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Fairly Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Very Important



#11690



Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	Henderson is so scary

**Tell us why**

not sure I'm like 14

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better public transport

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cultural development



**#11755**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Making public transport faster and cheaper is important

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Better and more reliable public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Too much redevelopment in the village as it is, the new development at Massey uni planning is big enough, we don't need more housing in the area, the roading infrastructure cannot handle it as it is.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#11755**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#11755



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#11755



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important





#11755



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The Stadium needs to be kept and maintained

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less road cones, less pedestrian crossings, less judder bars



**#11778**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Aucklanders need reliable public transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Second harbour crossing

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road cones

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The stadium is a fabulous asset to the North Shore and needs to be kept and maintained for sports and events

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#11778



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#11778



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#11778



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Not Important



#11778



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Fix pot holes and water keaks

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop wasting money on cycleways, pedestrian crossing, and changing names to Maori.





**#11819**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

No one wants to use public transport, it doesn't work in this country and it never will, to get from point a to point b takes you 4 times longer then by car.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

2nd harbour crossing

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road cones

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Why get rid of something that works for the shore

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Keep your assets when they are gone they are gone for good



**#11819**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Leasing it out will increase all items coming in to Auckland, because a leasing company will want to make there investment back. And make as much profit as possible

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Why change something that's working,

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#11819



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#11819



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important



#11819



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#11819**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do less
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#11823**



urban regeneration projects don't seem to offer significant value and most of the communities who have experienced this have been dissatisfied with the process and end results. This is not a priority in the current environment so stop this activity

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

cycleways should not be prioritised, particular when the local community do not support it. If they are to go ahead, they should involve minimum cost to deliver

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other





**#11823**



**Tell us here:**

move ports and sell land

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

sell these with leases so that they can be used to entertainment and dining precincts.  
Look at the examples in Hobart for how these are used

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

sell it and get the money. Why does Auckland council feel it has the ability or capacity to further develop these areas. Where is that money coming from given the current proposal is cutting costs everywhere. Sell it and invest the money

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#11823



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#11823



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Make sure targeted rates around Water Quality and Waitakere Rural Sewerage are passed on to Watercare and not held by Council.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

Other

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important



#11823



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

We do not need a new library. We have a library which is able to sufficiently meet the needs of the community and further investment in times of financial crisis is unnecessary.

Also, I am concerned with nearly \$1 million dedicated board governance. This

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

We do not need a new library. We have a library which is able to sufficiently meet the needs of the community and further investment in times of financial crisis is unnecessary.

Also, I am concerned with nearly \$1 million dedicated board governance. This needs more transparency on what is covered within this amount

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a**



**#11823**



**new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

this is not needed. Current library needs

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Re-instate public rubbish bin collection! Its a disgrace, local bins are overflowing causing health & safety issues, and terrible environmental damage.

More local childrens attractions like water parks.

Better disability parking access.



**#11862**



Better monitoring of illegal parking and carseat infringements.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Less on 'consultation' salaries, less on digging up roads that have just been installed.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Cycleways are essential for safety!

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Its a great asset, just very under-used.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#11862**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**





#11862



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#11862



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important



#11862



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Sports facilities desperately needed in this area. Absolutely should be a priority.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Some good strategies.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#11862**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Northern Region Football

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#11868**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We believe the \$33 million budgeted for the next ten years is best spent redeveloping the stadium into an appropriately sized, intimate venue to offer a better experience for sport and event fans, that's cost effective for hirers.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#11868



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#11868



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Invest into Community Facilities and Open Spaces

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#11928**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Support any additional investment into Public and Active Transport

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public and Active Transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Roads

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We need more investment into community sport and recreation infrastructure

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#11928**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

It means we can convert the port land to public space sooner

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#11928



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#11928



Change the **Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate** to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.

Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#11928



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I think there needs to be more focus on sport and recreation facilities due to the growing population and the massive shortage.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#11928**



### 8. Do you have any other comments?

- I support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.
- I advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#11943**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Improving motorways making them wider

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bicycle lanes raised pedestrian crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Current management is inept

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#11943



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#11943



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#11943



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney, Upper Harbour

## Rodney Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Not Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Very Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Not Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Not Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Very Important



#11943



Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Fairly Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Coatesville

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important



#11943



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#11943**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#12034**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

less on raised pedestrian crossings, and crossings and roundabouts everywhere

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Pick up the plans for doing something with it when we can afford to, not now

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#12034



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Do not support



#12034



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#12034



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

waste collections for North Shore, Waitakere, Papakura, etc - I support these being paid for from rates given rates have been high and residents have to pay extra for rubbish collection and have had to do so since the Supercity establishment while the Isthmus hasn't had that extra cost. Very concerned though about any proposal to increase their rates without providing information on how much this increase would be, along with all the other rate increases. Given residents have had to pay for their own rubbish collections for so long they have developed strategies/ways of working to reduce their costs eg only putting out a bin when it is completely full and so should not be penalised with an increase in rates that would be based on a universal every week collection cost.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Kaipātiki

**Howick Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Howick in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Review and refresh the Howick Heritage Plan.	
Review and refresh the Howick Tourism Plan.	
Encourage community groups to adopt a reserve, park, or waterway etc, and provide for restoration and maintenance activities with council support.	
Rescope the Industrial Pollution Prevention Programme (which educates and informs industry about the impacts they may have	



#12034



on local waterways) to broaden its outreach and include all businesses.	
Develop a community-led climate action plan.	
Explore the development of a Howick Ward 'business collective', or other group, to provide support for small business owners outside of the established Business Improvement Districts. This work may lead to establishing a new business association and possible new Business Improvement District (BID) programme.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Howick proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I do not support any priorities

**Kaipātiki Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Kaipātiki in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#12034



Investing in the maintenance and renewal of our parks, playgrounds, recreation facilities, and other public spaces so they continue to meet our communities needs.	Not Important
Supporting a community-led approach for the delivery of relevant and diverse services that connect the community	Not Important
Supporting environmental groups, community volunteers, and our diverse communities to carry out environmental restoration projects, including stream clean-ups, habitat improvement, native riparian planting, and pest control.	Not Important
Begin implementing the Mini Shoreline Adaptation Plan for the Little Shoal Bay / Te Wai Manawa alongside our community to address the issues caused by flooding and seawater inundation.	Not Important
Supporting a community climate activation programme to support and amplify community initiatives identified in the Kaipātiki Climate Action Plan.	Not Important
Building relationships with local iwi and mataawaka groups so that Kaipātiki is rich with Māori identity and culture.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Kaipātiki proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

AT needs to have better oversight on their spends. Watercare needs to work more as a council organisation. Eke Panuku needs to be bought into Council and had their role



**#12034**



changed to more property management, less urban regeneration (for a short term period until finances are looking healthier), Auckland Unlimited - remove them.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do more
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#12056**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#12056



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Proceed only if Port can finish Bledisloe

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	I don't know



#12056



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



**#12056**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More economic development/events that will appeal to a wide range of Aucklanders and attract a range of tourists, not as much for all the minorities which has little impact on the economic outcomes of the city (I don't mean cut minority events, just re-prioritise timing of spend to do other things as well e.g. bi-annual instead of annually).



#12185



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Stop agreeing to stupid roading plans - Upper Harbour cycle-way for example - what a waste of ratepayer dollars, (I hope that brain-child was fired).

Insist on better roading Contractors who can miraculously fix roads in weeks when required but take years when it suits them.

Train council staff to be more efficient, I submitted a question a month ago regarding council land outside my property and still have no response from the team that can do anything about it.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Makes sense

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Busways - the northern busway is a winner but there is little park & ride space and the feeder busses are too infrequent/not direct enough.

Other areas of Akl require busway or better train systems to free up the roads for trade and those who cannot take public transport.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways on arterial roads where there is no room - cars & bikes are dangerous together, cycles hold up traffic

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know



**#12185**



**Tell us why:**

Obviously isn't working well but no clarity why this really is the case.

See comment on better events promotion above.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

If we are able to profit more from overseas operators utilising the port, without selling it to them, being more cost efficient for Aucklanders then we are able to divert our funds and efforts to other areas.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

We need to look to the Future, council services should be able to be run from rates with the efficiencies proposed.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#12185



**Tell us here:**

- be bold
- money is never going to be cheaper than right now, borrow if you must
- have a future focus for our city
- do not allow the wasteful spending that has been happening to continue

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Make our city a more appealing place to live by developing our tourist areas and utilising for public use

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't think we need too many big plans - keep to the current projects and finish them as the Mayor notes in his proposal.

The land value would be better kept in the Port if the decision to lease goes ahead (or thereafter).

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by	Support
---	---------





#12185



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#12185



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Fairly Important



#12185



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Just my preferences

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

OK

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

The library is fine - we use it regularly and it meet our needs.



**#12185**



8. Do you have any other comments?

No



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12197**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#12197



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#12197



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





**#12197**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal



**#12202**



**Tell us why:**

The only way to reduce traffic is to have a functioning alternative. For example, you can't put in congestion charging until there is the capacity to get everyone in to the city on public transport. Rail to the north shore will be key to this.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Harbour crossing. If the Chelsea Super works was relocation the harbour bridge wouldn't need to be so tall.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Dump projects like raising crossings.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Reduce the capacity of the stadium to 10,000. Making it easier to fill the stadium for events

Remove the grandstand and recreate it with a bowl style around the main field.

There is currently a lot of sport associations based there. These buildings should all be demolished and moved to under the new open seating that is around the main field. Add in a running track around one of the fields and create a multi use fitness path way.

The leisure centre should be extended to have a 25m lap pool that is 2m deep. To enable better community access for sports and leisure swimming.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#12202**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Lease the operations of the port.

Have a master plan that over that 35years the port land is reclaimed back for public usage as a large urban seaside park.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

The Auckland future fund has the potential to be a white elephant, that slowly sells of the councils share holdings every time there is a new mayor.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#12202



**Tell us why:**

The old wharves should be returned to the people of Auckland and converted in to a seaside park, creating a large green space on the harbours edge.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Having a green space that fronts the city as a park area would be the best use of this land.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#12202



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Rodney, Upper Harbour



#12202



## Rodney Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	Not Important
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Fairly Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Not Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Not Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Very Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Fairly Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Not Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Not Important



#12202



**Tell us why**

The local board needs to focus on reducing cost, whilst maintaining core current infrastructure.

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

There seems to be a lack of focus in the Warkworth, Sandspit, Snells Beach, Kawau Island and Alge's bay areas. These are all growing at a fast rate.

It needs to be user pay's, currently sports that use green fields do not get charged to use them. This is a large burden on the council. Other sports that use indoor facilities get charged. why is this different green spaces have a high cost to continually maintain.

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**

Kawau Island

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important





#12202



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

It needs to be user pay's, currently sports that use green fields do not get charged to use them. This is a large burden on the council. Other sports that use indoor facilities get charged. why is this different green spaces have a high cost to continually

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It needs to be user pay's, currently sports that use green fields do not get charged to use them. This is a large burden on the council. Other sports that use indoor facilities get charged. why is this different green spaces have a high cost to continually maintain.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**



**#12202**



None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

It needs to be user pay's, currently sports that use green fields do not get charged to use them. This is a large burden on the council. Other sports that use indoor facilities get charged. why is this different green spaces have a high cost to continually

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Council needs to move to a user pays model for leisure and recreation spaces. Currently sports that use greenspaces do not get charged to use them. This is a large burden on the council. Other sports that use indoor facilities get charged. why is this different green spaces have a high cost to continually maintain.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12379**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Keep proposed cycleways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland airport shares are not a good investment, I wouldn't hold them in my personal investment portfolio, so I think the money could be better used elsewhere. I also recognise the need to spread risk.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#12379**



**Tell us here:**

Council is in so much debt it makes better financial sense to take the upfront payment of \$2.1 billion and invest this, than to take the dividends from the port operations. Diversification of investments. Also this will lesson the rates increase, which is a huge problem in these times of struggle for many Aucklanders.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

I don't want Council services to be cut.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

I think the future fund should be managed internally because professional/eternal fund managers take a cut and it will transfer a huge amount of money from Auckland people to the pockets of fund management companies.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#12379



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#12379



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important



#12379



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#12402**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#12402



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#12402



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 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>	



#12402



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Puketāpapa, Upper Harbour

## Puketāpapa Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Puketāpapa in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Invest in opportunities to support local community leadership.	Fairly Important
Invest in climate change response initiatives and support volunteer groups working on local environmental restoration / protection and climate action programmes.	Very Important
Consider our investment in facilities and services to see if there are opportunities to do better.	Very Important
Support initiatives that improve and encourage walking and cycling opportunities.	Fairly Important
Help coordinate and support local business groups.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**



#12402



7c. What do you think of the Puketāpapa proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

Tell us why



**#12402**



**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

No

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#12404**



No

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I don't use public transport a lot

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

No

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

No

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I'm not quite sure

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I'm don't know a lot on the topic



#12404



4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?

Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

N/a

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Other



#12404



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



**#12404**



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Not really

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

No



**#12405**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#12405



I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#12405



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





**#12405**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12407**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know



#12407



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#12407



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#12407



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know



**#12407**



Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

sports grounds

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

n/a





**#12413**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

bc it sounds good

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

n/a

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

more seats for bigger events

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i don't know

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#12413**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

i don't know

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

save money

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

no

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i don't know the information

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

More transport



#12413



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	



#12413



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

no

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Albert-Eden,Henderson-Massey,Upper Harbour

**Albert-Eden Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Albert-Eden in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Celebrating different people and cultures, bringing people together with fun and engaging activities, and reducing barriers for those who might struggle to connect with council or others in the community.	Very Important
Continuing our environmental work through tree planting, parks restoration, supporting volunteer pest control and planting groups	Very Important



#12413



and helping community climate action through our Climate Activator.	
Planning for how our parks and open space can respond to growth, making the most of what we have, balancing different uses and connecting green spaces together.	Fairly Important
Supporting our community groups with funding, information, learning new skills and building their capability and networks.	Very Important
Settling in at the new, medium-term location for the Pt Chevalier library and continuing to investigate what the long-term library solution might be and how we will fund it.	Fairly Important
Working with the community on activations in the Mt Albert Civic Square.	Fairly Important
Making our parks rubbish-bin free to minimise waste and improve environmental and climate outcomes.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

idk

**7c. What do you think of the Albert-Eden proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

good

**Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

Fairly Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#12413



Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Fairly Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Very Important
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Fairly Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	bc it sounds good

**Tell us why**

gopd

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
--	----------------



#12413



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

it sounds good

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

cheaper

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#12413**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

good

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

na





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Public Transport



#12435



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Putting a weekly cap on public transport passes is a great idea for people who don't have as much money to spend

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bus fares

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

I believe that the stadium is effective for what it does and does not need changing

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**Tell us here:**

Ownership of key any key warf should be kept in council hands

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Improving the port should be a priority over the gain of money

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

The ferrys need the extra space both warfs give

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Same reason as above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#12435



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#12435



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

nope



**#12446**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#12446



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to	





#12446



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#12446**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Yes

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**#12447**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I.m not sure

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i.m not sure

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i.m not sure

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#12447**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

I.m not sure

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

i.m not sure

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

..

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i.m not sure

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

i.. not sure



#12447



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#12447



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

not thig

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

no



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Public transport reliability

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#12471**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Most of it is reasonable

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Walkways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Building extra motorway lanes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This is an important part of North Shore for the community

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#12471



Tell us here:

It would improve the operation at Auckland Port and generate funds

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#12471



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#12471



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Fairly Important



#12471



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Yea

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Yes



**#12472**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Yes

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Yes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Yes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Yes

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Idk

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#12472**



Other

**Tell us here:**

Idk

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Idk

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Ues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I'm

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Ok





#12472



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#12472



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Ok

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Aotea/Great Barrier

## Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?**

I don't know

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works.	I don't know
Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets.	I don't know



#12472



Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide.	I don't know
Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

Ok

**7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Ok



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Review staff and their input. Get rid off those that are not needed Stop wastage

Them put some of that money back in community as much needed



**#12507**



Council sign off the consents on homes so people can move in sooner as many sit empty waiting for consents for months and months. It would free up rental for those needing them.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

As above. Stop wastage spending and wages.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Inner city rails goes where and the cost and who in Auckland does it really service for the amount of people in city versus cost which could take more to outer regions

Still none to airport or North Shore but all goes south and west.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Extending highway north on 1 and thru Kumeu region to 16

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

City centre development.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

A massive facility and not utilised enough



**#12507**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Unsure about airport Feel it is good to have some NZ interest in a major NZ company

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The wharf should go to Whangārei and Tauranga to take some of laid and create jobs especially for northern region

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

All this expense is taking away the NZ dream of home ownership as the cost is making it harder one to purchase but maintain ownership due to rates increase. Especially the elderly also who have lived in their homes for years and still entitled to rather than the bludging retirement home financial schemes

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Move it



#12507



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

Move it but we don't need another stadium downtown. We have enough per population They just need some upgrades

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#12507



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Maybe costs could come from new developments and this so called infill housing when's a property is up for development as it increases demands on systems





#12507



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know



**#12507**



**Tell us why**

Sports field essential as there is very little space and activities for the children in the region. Get them outside to play and participate in sports activities

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Ok

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Not needed So many library within 10-20K Schools and universities have libraries and many books floating in shops all free. And people google so much now for information

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12622**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#12622



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#12622



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

- Transport - we need better public transport to tackle the current traffic issues that are impacting on the quality of life of all Aucklanders. Taking 1.5 hours to go from Auckland West to Auckland Central every morning is not acceptable.
- Rubbish bins - we need better waste management in my area (Hobsonville Point). The area has seen lots of growth and is getting more visitors now that we have the



**#12653**



boardwalk and shops, leading to overflowing rubbish bins and discarded rubbish/poop bags due to the lack of bins.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

- Council costs - Auckland Council does not manage its contractors efficiently. A job was needed at the Sunderland Lounge (council managed) that was quoted for \$10k. The Hobsonville Community Trust intervened and managed to get another quote for the same job for \$2k. This would have been an unacceptable waste of ratepayer money.

- Household rubbish bin collections could go down to fortnightly as other cities such as Christchurch

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

- Transport - we need better public transport to tackle the current traffic issues that are impacting on the quality of life of all Aucklanders. Taking 1.5 hours to go from Auckland West to Auckland Central every morning is not acceptable.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**





**#12653**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

This is a good investment and will return ROI in the long term. Investment needs diversification though to mitigate risks.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#12653



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#12653



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#12653



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#12653**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

- We need more rubbish bins around Hobsonville Point
- We need an offramp and onramp in Squadron Drive to/from Westgate to relieve congestion on Hobsonville Road.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12690**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Selling the port operations would end up costing the people of Auckland money.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#12690



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	





#12690



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

no

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

no



**#12694**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#12694



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#12694



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#12694**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12698**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Raised platforms have a purpose in the right situation. I do not believe they should be ruled out all together

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**





#12698



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#12698



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



#12698



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important



#12698



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Wait till finances improve

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the excessive management of each department of the city council and reduce the waste of resources.



**#12706**



The increase in property taxes should be formulated based on the current economic situation, the overall cost of living of residents, the inflation rate and other factors.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

The current cost of public transportation has no obvious advantage over driving a car, and it is more expensive for many people.

We hope to further reduce the cost of public transportation, especially for people who use it frequently.

In addition, we should try to shorten the time of road construction, limit the construction time to special periods, and reduce the impact on traffic.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

I hope Beigang Stadium can increase revenue and reduce expenditure

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#12706**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Part of it could be used to fund council services, with the rest going into the Auckland Future Fund

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#12706



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support





#12706



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop paying out benefits to the lazy people who wont go back to work. Scale it over a period of time (I think like Switzerland) There are far too many other handouts as well.



**#12731**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#12731



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	



#12731



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#12731**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12734**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**





#12734



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#12734



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#12734



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important



#12734



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour  
Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Not Important

### Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12751**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#12751



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#12751



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**





#12751



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important



**#12751**



Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Transportation specifically public transport network is essential and known as the first priority that a government should focus on to bring people around. That will enhance the population rates, hence, the growth of economy as people travel around with ease and conveniently.



**#12797**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Environment and regulations as well as Park and Community provided to date is within lower usage as others which I believe can be done lesser compared to the basic needs - transports and supports in mitigating emergencies/crisis.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I oppose the increase of expenses on road user when public transport has not been enhanced. By all means collections of toll fee or any other fee for road maintenance can be execute, ONLY WHEN options such as public transport are conveniently and reliably provided to the public. With frequency of buses and trains at peak hour increases, introducing road user payment over the motorway will promote more public transport users.

Appreciate the plan comes with specific actions when speaking about "making public transport faster, more reliable, and easier to use". Elaboration of by how you doing that provide assurance to the public and will impact the swift of choosing transportation mode.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

PUBLIC TRANSPORT - high frequencies, wider network means more stops at dense population areas, maintenance during off peak hours (midnight), punctuality of public transport in order to be more reliable, plan ahead of maintenance and make a month advance of announcement for public to plan on their travels.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Nothing, please invest more on transport putting public transport as priority.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management



**#12797**



**Tell us why:**

Spending at minimal cost to consider the change of operational management with the target of long-term planning in operating the stadium with lower expense.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Government supports in airlines is needed to allow affordable connectivity of locals to global world, include business opportunities and keeping tourisms alive. Government should own major part of the airlines as its investment of connectivity to worldwide - otherwise, NZ will living silo!

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Supporting the lease the operation but that depends on how is that impact to the aucklanders. How reliable and effective is the new operation management, speaking as an end user point of view.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#12797



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support



#12797



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#12797



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Aotea/Great Barrier, Henderson-Massey, Upper Harbour

## Aotea/Great Barrier Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Aotea/Great Barrier in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Continue the regular programme of funding for community groups to deliver services and environmental groups to deliver ecology works.	Fairly Important
Continue our regular maintenance of parks and assets.	Fairly Important
Investigate improvements for playground areas island-wide.	Not Important
Support implementation of aspects of the new Destination Management Plan.	Very Important

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Aotea/Great Barrier proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Safety is not mentioned. Continue the regular maintenance of parks and assets by doing how? Safety within this area is a concern which is not mentioned and planned.

## Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?





#12797



Very Important

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Fairly Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Very Important
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of 'fit for purpose' local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Fairly Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	This area is developing and growing fast with increase of population. Transport connectivity, supports in public facilities as well as safety should be the priority.

**Tell us why**

This area is developing and growing fast with increase of population. Transport connectivity, supports in public facilities as well as safety should be the priority.

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities



#12797



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I support the development plans related to transport connectivity for all users, as well as development plan on the land use.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell**



**#12797**



land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#12815**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium was profitable under North Shore City Council. Since super city formation it has become bastardised and neglected. We want it back in our control and properly utilized

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#12815



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#12815



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#12948**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#12948



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#12948



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Re Upper Harbour Water Access. It is important to ensure the growing population of Hobsonville Point and nearby areas have the ability to launch and retrieve small craft so they can enjoy the recreation and exercise the Upper Harbour offers .



**#12948**



As the upper reaches are tidal it leaves few options for all tide access apart from Greenhithe and Hobsonville Point ramps,the latter is now restricted by its poor condition. The new marine centre looks like it will be limited in its ability to cater for many people who wish to avail themselves of its facilities, as its restricted position doesn't appear to have much space for launching and retrieval of small craft.

The large sea plane ramp is worth upgrading both for historical significance and its present uses ,dinghy ,rowing and launching kayaks etc.

It's so unfortunate that the Catalina development has taken so much space,reducing ease of access.As an older member of the community I now rarely go to the area which I used to enjoy.

I used to launch my paddle board off the little ramp at Christmas Beach at high water but that ramp too is deteriorating and could.do with a bit of maintenance..

Hobsonville Point is promoted as a seaside area but it needs to ensure access to the sea for the small craft owners ,kids in kayaks.etc.

Liz Patel 20 Mapou Rd Hobsonville Point



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Walkways, better and brighter street lighting

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Cycleways



**#12969**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use by investing in rapid transit network actions,

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Better roads and public transport and clean water for all.  
public/community hubs and park, reserves etc.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

A great community venue for all, should be managed in a way where hiring it out for at reasonable rates for functions like movies, functions, parties, weddings etc. will bring in enough revenue for maintenance.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#12969**



**Tell us why:**

Protect and Keep Auckland's assets with the council

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Protect and Keep Auckland's assets with the council for the betterment of Auckland.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Keep all Auckland assets with Auckland Council, in trustworthy hands.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Protect and Keep Auckland's assets with the council protect the staff- plus this area is needed to carry out the ports work in a safe manner.



#12969



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support





#12969



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Keep the rates low. It is extremely hard for families to put food on the table! At such a time increasing rates does not help at all!

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Henderson-Massey, Rodney, Upper Harbour, Waitākere Ranges, Waitemata

**Henderson-Massey Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Henderson-Massey in 2024/2025?**

Very Important

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#12969



Our People – create opportunities that support connectedness, diversity and inclusion in our community.	Very Important
Our Environment – focus on initiatives that increase tree canopy cover, improve water health and provide for resilient and low carbon communities across Henderson-Massey.	Very Important
Our Community – ensure the maintenance and development of ‘fit for purpose’ local services and spaces meet the needs of our diverse communities.	Very Important
Our Places – support initiatives that improve walking and cycling opportunities.	Very Important
Our Economy – continue to support the Western Initiative to deliver the Youth Connections programme.	

**Tell us why**

It is a great plan

**7c. What do you think of the Henderson-Massey proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**Rodney Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Rodney in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver new and/or improved playground and play spaces in Goodall Reserve, Te	Very Important
---	----------------



#12969



Hana Reserve, Rautawhiri Park and Riverhead War Memorial Park.	
Support communities to develop local community emergency leadership groups and emergency action planning in response to the findings of the Emergency Response Assessment study being undertaken in 2023/2024.	Fairly Important
Provide additional activities and programmes for children and young people maximising the use of our libraries, halls and open spaces, where possible.	Very Important
Continue to support our local arts centres in Helensville and Kumeu and look to extend arts experiences to other parts of Rodney.	Very Important
Continue to support community groups and mana whenua to keep our waterways clean and healthy and restore biodiversity.	Very Important
Support the community to minimise waste, turn it into resources, and promote education on waste reduction.	Very Important
Develop and refurbish toilet facilities in Glasgow Park, Dinning Road Esplanade Reserve and Port Albert Recreation Reserve.	Very Important
Develop pathway connections in Green Road Park.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Rodney proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**As our local board area is so large, please tell us where you live so we can better understand the views from different communities**



#12969



Not from the Rodney area

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



#12969



7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

Which of the following options do you support?

None of the above

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

Fundraising events can help out

## Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	I support most priorities
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	Very Important
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	Very Important
Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	Very Important



#12969



Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	Very Important
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	Very Important
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	Very Important
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	Very Important
Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

Very Important

**7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

it is a great plan

**Waitematā Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitematā in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Deliver a new civic space at 254 Ponsonby Road.	Very Important
Complete detailed design of Leys Institute remediation and seismic strengthening, and progress physical works.	Very Important



#12969



Phased delivery of improvements for Heard Park.	Fairly Important
Deliver services and programmes that support youth activation, leadership, and wellbeing, particularly in Newmarket.	Very Important
Develop programmes that improve perceptions of safety within the City Centre, and our town-centres.	Very Important
Support local communities to develop Emergency Planning & Readiness Response Plans.	Very Important
Seek opportunities to promote and celebrate heritage places in Waitemata including making digital content and place-based stories more accessible.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Waitemata proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Please keep rates low!



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#13007**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Provides a revenue stream that can be used to repair/replace infrastructure



#13007



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

Because I don't know

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#13007



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#13007



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important



#13007



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

I don't know

### Tell us why

#### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

Laudable, aspirational

#### 7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

#### Which of the following options do you support?

Investigate options to sell land

Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?

#### 8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

reduce rates and stop making city center difficult to access

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

yes less public transport, cycle ways and



**#13031**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

public transport and raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways is not what money should be wasted on.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

disability services, main roads and disable parking

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

public transport and raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Stop selling assets and turning land into house boxes and apartment we need more green spaces and parks. could lease out the fields for sport teams and event

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#13031**



Why keep selling assets, the council are wasting billions of rate payers money with poor money management and very poor customer services presently

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

retain ownership but lease for shorter timeframe but do not sell the land make sure that is written in law

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

because council does not know how to save and manage funds/money

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

keep ownership lease for shorter time make sure it can not be sold off and let the funds grow in trust and strict criteria of use.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

why keep adding buildings on land find other uses ie more dam parking





#13031



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

as long as its not sold off to be soo short sighted make sure this culd never be sold and always keep under council ownership

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Other
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Other
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support



#13031



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

need more bullet points on this, you have made this survey difficult for people with dyslexia. I do not fund buss services/public transport, raised presidian and cycle ways. stop selling off assests

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities



#13031



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

where is a pool going to be installed in hobsonville???

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell**



**#13031**



land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

stop selling land and bild a pool in hobsonville and be more disable freindly

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

build pool in hobsonville and be disable freindly for ehab services



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13034**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport is horrible, Auckland traffic is insane, these two alone are massive reasons why highly skilled people are leaving Auckland. We need to fix this.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

We need our entertainment

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It's a good plan

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#13034**



**Tell us here:**

Ports of Auckland IS Auckland, we are the city of sails, we can't have someone else leasing it and running it their way.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Both invest in the future fund and council services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Use it for something that will benefit the city and the people, Maybe some sort of tourist attraction like a ferris wheel?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#13034



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#13034



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know



#13034



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Our area is a new development but I don't see it staying that way. Already the roads are falling apart, the sidewalks and surrounding areas are not maintained, you've removed multiple public rubbish bins which has just caused people to litter our streets, focus and fix the basics first.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land



**#13034**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Maintenance of roadsides/kerbs/berms/drains. I live in a semi-rural area and these areas are poorly maintained. It's a wonder the flooding of 2023 wasn't worse.

Also, facilitating use of buses by ensuring people have access to parking at parknrides - currently full early in the morning which discourages the public from using our awesome northern express buses.



**#13038**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Would prefer less change to rubbish/recycling. The new system doesn't make sense to me - user pays will always encourage people to generate less refuse and think harder about where their rubbish goes. If we have already paid, many will simply fill their bins without thinking and our problem will increase. Too late I guess...

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I feel there must be a better way than congestion charging. Perhaps the funds that would be used to set this up and administer it could be used to improve access to public transport such as improve parkrides and fares structured to incentivise off-peak vs on-peak travel

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Saving the Albany Stadium complex.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Changing the rubbish/recycling system but too late...

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The idea has been discussed in our local community to propose a transformative solution that could benefit us all.

Let's relocate the library into the stadium premises, along with offices for the local board or boards. By consolidating these essential services, we can create a vibrant community hub that caters to diverse needs. I understand putting the library here has



**#13038**



been discussed and cannot go in the current buildings, but perhaps it could be housed in a dedicated building. Money will need to be spent with the current lease expiring soon anyway.

This move would provide several benefits:

**Centralized Hub:** The stadium would become more than just a sports arena; it would become the heart of our community, offering a range of services and facilities under one roof.

**Ample Parking:** With the combined space, we can ensure ample parking facilities, addressing a pressing need for accessibility and convenience.

**Shared Resources:** By sharing spaces and resources, we optimize efficiency and reduce overhead costs, ensuring sustainable management of our community assets.

**Enhanced Collaboration:** Proximity fosters collaboration. Having offices for local boards within the same premises as the library encourages greater interaction and cooperation among stakeholders.

**Ownership and Control:** Consolidating these facilities under our ownership empowers us to make decisions that best serve the interests of our community, ensuring long-term sustainability and resilience.

It's evident that our current approach may not be serving the broader needs of our community. Let's embrace this opportunity to think creatively and strategically about how we utilize our resources to enhance the well-being of everyone in our region.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#13038**



**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Perhaps a combination of both options

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

It depends on whether it is also going to cost a huge amount of ratepayers' money to develop it into something for public benefit. Especially if this draws funds/people away from Albany Stadium complex. North Shore residents pay a significant portion of r

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

as for my answer in 5a

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#13038



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>





#13038



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#13038



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13068**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Public transport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

If maintenance costs are increasing as the building ages it makes sense to consider redevelopment to better meet community needs and minimise future maintenance costs.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

I'm not convinced that setting up a fund and diverting large amounts of money into it, to hopefully make more money, at a time when council services that meet community needs are most at risk of being cut is the best option as opposed to paying down debt.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#13068**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I support a lease proposal but would prefer the money went directly to meeting community needs it paying down debt, instead of being diverted away into a fund.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#13068



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#13068



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Improvements to water infrastructure are important and should be increased not reduced

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important



#13068



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**





**#13068**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I would like the sale of Bomb Point to council to finally go through, after being promised this for over a decade.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13079**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management, Other

**Tell us why:**

Keep the stadium, but redevelop some of the existing community playing fields for other indoor sports of increasing demand and short supply, such as basketball etc.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#13079



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#13079



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#13079



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know



#13079



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Don't just think about raising local taxes, thinking that only by increasing revenue can things be done; you must also start from saving money (reducing costs) to do things.

The current work efficiency is too low and needs to be improved. When efficiency is improved, costs will naturally come down.





**#13095**



An accountability system should be established. At present, the performance of some senior management is poor enough. It is recommended to replace this role with someone with strong ability (such as watercare, AT). Why are the salaries of similar positions so high? It shouldn't cost so much taxpayers' money! Their achievements for the citizens are really not worthy of such salaries.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Don't just think about raising local taxes, thinking that only by increasing revenue can things be done; you must also start from saving money (reducing costs) to do things.

The current work efficiency is too low and needs to be improved. When efficiency is improved, costs will naturally come down.

An accountability system should be established. At present, the performance of some senior management is poor enough. It is recommended to replace this role with someone with strong ability (such as watercare, AT). Why are the salaries of similar positions so high? It shouldn't cost so much taxpayers' money! Their achievements for the citizens are really not worthy of such salaries.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The current efficiency is too low and needs to be improved. If the efficiency is improved, the cost will naturally go down.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**



**#13095**



At present, its usage rate is extremely low, but the cost of maintenance and repair is certainly not small, and I am afraid that the income is not enough to cover the expenses. This situation must change, which can truly benefit the North Shore community.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

This would generate revenue while the City Council still retains ownership, giving the best of both worlds.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#13095



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

If no better solution is proposed, we are willing to maintain the status quo.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

Hope to see a specific plan

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#13095



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13116**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This is an excellent facility when there were events and under previous management

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#13116



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#13116



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?





#13116



I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell**



**#13116**



land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Live within budget, you take more money you waste more money, get efficient, get rid of the rot

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13122**



Selling assets for sort term gain

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Make it more efficient

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Roads

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Road safety initiatives that get effective results, almost everything that is being pushed" to achieve zero harm" -rubbish

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is,Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Put people in operational management that are proactive in making the Stadium a better product, not running it down

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#13122**



This is a way to water down and then dispose of the asset!!!!

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Its obvious, keep ownership for long term income, not dilute and sell for short term gains

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Council should be looking after our local infrastructure, not making money

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

I do not believe the councils intent.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#13122



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support



#13122



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Fairly Important



#13122



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

Cut the liberal "woke" ideology, get on with providing the basic services and get them right

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Most of it appears to be relevant.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**





**#13122**



Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

All depends what land you are proposing to sell and why. If it not benefiting the community, sell.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Stop adding more the construction work in Auckland CBD.



**#13136**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

AT is quite dysfunctional - dozens of Auckland trains were cancelled due to hot weather, buses don't show up at peak times, "special vehicle lane" signs in CBD are unclear and lead to traffic tickets being issued, delayed and constant road works in the CBD making it extremely hard to drive around, etc.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

network optimisation, reducing temporary traffic management requirements and introducing dynamic lanes.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The board members have higher and higher salaries every year, why?

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#13136



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#13136



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#13136



Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

We should encourage more items to be recycled, such as used pens, oral care products, coffee capsules. There should be more drop-off points in schools, stores and public facilities.

Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#13136



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

More Local Crime Prevention Fund and safety initiatives investment should be taken into consideration.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#13136**



Should consider private donors.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13142**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#13142



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#13142



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Library services

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13209**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It's essential for the North Shore to have adequate sporting facilities. Given the density of population on the Shore, the local population should not always have to travel over the bridge to major events.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#13209



Tell us here:

The lease option restricts the flexibility of action of future Councils for too long.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#13209



increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	





#13209



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Very Important



#13209



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

I do not support the transfer of public land to private ownership.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13213**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#13213



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#13213



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#13213



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important



#13213



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13248**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#13248



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual</p>	



#13248



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



**#13248**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Tax Destiny Church. I'd pay for that.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13264**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Public transport is essential for getting our emissions down and current it's not operating well. I'm mad as \*\*\*\*\* at the govt, but I guess we have to do what we have to do (and vote the bastards out)

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I live close enough to it, but never go there. I don't know what is there now so can't say for sure.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#13264



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

Money is important and there's a lot going on at the Viaduct precinct for the community

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support





#13264

increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#13264



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	I don't know



#13264



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I'm sorry I'm too busy to read - I know it's not an educated response but I've been very busy :(

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Sounds good lol

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13267**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#13267



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	<p>Support</p>



#13267



from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#13267

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important





**#13267**



Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13341**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

The stadium precinct is fine the way it is

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I think it's a wise move to add more sources of income for the council in the future

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#13341



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#13341



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#13341



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Waitākere Ranges

## Waitākere Ranges Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Waitākere Ranges in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Initiatives to support community resilience and safety.	I support most priorities
Progress priority actions from the Waitākere Ranges Local Climate Plan (currently under development).	Very Important
Restoration and enhancement of significant ecological areas on local parks and in buffer zones around the regional park.	Not Important
Operating grants for arts and culture programmes delivered by our community arts partners, such as Te Uru.	Fairly Important
Continue to activate library spaces with programmes, services and events.	Fairly Important
Operating grants to support Glen Eden and Titirangi Community Houses.	Very Important
Invest in our relationship with mana whenua, Te Kawerau ā Maki.	Fairly Important
Initiatives to support youth/rangatahi.	Not Important



**#13341**



Progress an application for Waitakere Ranges Heritage Area to become a dark sky place.

Very Important

**Tell us why**

Very Important

**7c. What do you think of the Waitākere Ranges proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Surf lifesaving clubs play a vital role in our community, providing essential services to keep our beaches safe. However, many of these facilities are reaching end-of-life and are in need of replacement. Without adequate funding, our clubs will struggle to continue their lifesaving work effectively.





**#13357**



Without fit-for-purpose facilities that people enjoy visiting, the Auckland region risks losing the volunteers who provide the service, spelling the end of more than a hundred years of vigilance on our beaches.

We therefore request that Auckland Council allocates \$8.02 million in funding within the Long Term Plan specifically earmarked for the rebuilds and ongoing maintenance of surf lifesaving club facilities, as per SLSNR's Surf 10:20 Capital Development proposal.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#13357



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate</p>	



#13357



<p>from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#13357**



With regard to Question 1C, Council has a central proposal that recommends spending more where it is needed most. Surf Life Saving facilities are a critical component of our community. They have served as temporary welfare and community centres, as well as civil defence centres during regional emergencies, including during the Auckland Anniversary flooding and Cyclone Gabrielle.

Our facilities aren't a nice to have, they are the heart of our service. Allocated funding is essential to ensure the continued operation of our clubs and the safety of beachgoers. The amount requested is minimal when compared to the benefit it will have for the region.

## Local board priorities

### 7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

### 8. Do you have any other comments?

Surf Life Saving has a long standing partnership with Auckland Council. Most recently, it has partnered with Surf Life

Saving through the previous LTP to deliver numerous capital refurbishment & rebuild projects of our clubs facilities. An

updated proposal has been sent to Auckland Council for consideration to be included in the 2024-34 LTP. This

proposal will see a contribution to fund a further four Surf Life Saving capital projects at Bethells Beach, Mairangi Bay,

Omaha and Piha. Without this support, it will be exceedingly challenging for Surf Life Saving Northern Region to

continue to fulfill its obligations as an Emergency Service(as listed in the Auckland Council Unitary Plan) in the long

term.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Resume national environment targeted rate.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Development of city centre (excluding transport related projects).



**#13389**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Like reliable transport which is frequent.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Extending and maintaining bus lanes.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycle lanes. introducing capped weekly public transport passes because the cap will probably exceed my needs I

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Do not get rid of the stadium. Change management and make it a venue fit for purpose. The location is so perfect but underutilised. We have a large population north of the bridge and need it.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



#13389



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support



#13389



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know





#13389



Increase the Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I don't know

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Fairly Important



#13389



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Keep the 50% off public transport! Make more parking available and cheaper/Free

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Keep the 50% off public transport! Make more parking available and cheaper/Free



**#13412**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Keep the 50% off public transport! Make more parking available and cheaper/Free

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Keep the 50% off public transport! Make more parking available and cheaper/Free

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**



#13412



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#13412



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Keep the 50% off public transport! Make more parking available and cheaper/Free

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#13412**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Keep the 50% off public transport! Make more parking available and cheaper/Free



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#13452**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Auckland needs an efficient high public transport system and then needs to actively move people from private cars into public transport - or make them pay for the privilege of their private drive

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Redeveloping Auckland centre to increase inner city living, entertainment (new stadium) and conference centre and termination of public transport networks

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Dedicated cycle ways being retrofitted- should be included in new roads at sustainable costs.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### Tell us why:

Under-utilised facilities not in line with current needs. Improve public transport hub, social sports facilities (community oriented) and fund this through redevelopment with offices and residential accommodation.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



#13452



Establishing a diversified (internationally and by asset class) will provide a hedge against local disasters and economic cycles. Funded the sale of local assets will remove the risk of emotional investment decisions where council has no skill/competitive management edge and is treated as the funder of last resort.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

The council needs to develop a plan for an integrated city centre without a cargo port (life after the port) that would include a stadium, housing, offices, hospitality, conference centre with cruise ship terminal and intergrated public transport

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The port needs to be operated on a commercial basis and deliver a return to its shareholder. This economic outcome should be objectively compared to other options and the land allocated to the best most sustainable plan. An example is the Cape Town waterfront where it's a world class development that has been sold to a foreign owner. We need a similar development plan that could combine the best commercial planning with ownership vesting in the city through a fund - line hi g Kong has does with the mtr and other public assets

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Be bold - be clear and give people well framed choices- the fact will set us all free of the noise. And give council a clear mandate. Current plans are timid and not laid out with a vision for progress phased development. Do it once, do it right, make Auckland the world class city it should be.



#13452



**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Taking back these sections of the port is the first step in developing and then delivering on the redevelopment plan. Development can be funded by the developers with the city earning the ground lease and rates on the values of the properties built.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

See reason above

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value</p>	<p>Support</p>



#13452



residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No



#13452



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important



**#13452**



### Tell us why

Don't know what this is so it can't be important (to me)

### **7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Modest but achievable and focused on ensuring the local community has its more direct needs met.

### **7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

### **Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

### **Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Can this form part of the redevelopment of the Albany stadium precinct ?

### **8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Drop waste bags so residents can tidy the public spaces/reserves (eg remove pest plants)

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13456**



Use less roadcones

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Electric busses & much smaller electric busses (20 people) for non-peak times & less busy routes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Raised pedestrian crossings

Decorative concrete bridges

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**





**#13456**



Other

**Tell us here:**

Move the port, sell the land to develop a shopping/hotel/restaurant precinct with a stadium (like Cape Town's V&A) - don't sell it to a non-NZ company (money/profits have to stay in NZ)

Keep cruise ships coming in

Lease land to big corporates

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#13456



Tell us why:

See above

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support



#13456



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	Very Important



#13456



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land



**#13456**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Light rail, better train services

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#13470



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support





#13470



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#13470



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important



#13470



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13512**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I like the idea of max cost per week for public transport, making average cost less. Standard cost for irregular or lower level users.

Raised crossings are not value for money or actually slowing folks down. Ridiculous costs of bike lanes like the ill water upper harbour drive one that leads to .... oh wait a main highway with no bike lane or space for one or even a footpath. j

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Sports facilities.... kids and adults in sport are less likely to get in trouble and are healthier.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

This facility was paid for by the community, the North Shore needs a venue of this size.

The fields and surrounds have significant use.

The issue is the lack of investment in the facility once it was handed over in good faith to council.

As a community facility to should not cost the GDP of Fiji to hold events, that is why it is underutilized and ROI to keep it going is failing. Charge less, keep it full and make a better ROI.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#13512**



Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

You do not note the return on the lease of 35 years and who is responsible the maintenance. .... what will the net return be on this option to lease. Until that is clear and worthwhile we should remain with status quo.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Use the profit to invest in infrastructure and keep rates as low as possible.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#13512



Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

I agree with this if the operations of the port are possible in the remaining space.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#13512



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Other
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities





#13512



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate**



**#13512**



following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Given the issues faced by Massey University and the significant amount of vacant land around it surely there is an option to co locate and contribute to wider community.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More buses

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13566**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#13566



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#13566



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	I don't know
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	I don't know



#13566



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know



#13566



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

None of the above

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

more separate cycle commuter transport routes in conjunction with NZTA, dual carriageway higher speed arterial express routes to complement motorways - as they do in the UK. Safer for all.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13602**



less low speed, traffic calming measures and cycle lane barriers, the cost is not worth the few deaths it might possibly save,

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Do not do congestion charging, it is flawed and does not work

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

encouraging EV use over petrol

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The north shore needs a venue, make sure we can also use it for concert events

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

only if the revenue over time is better than continued revenue from shares but try to retain some control over airport pricing



#13602



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

**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

Do not support



#13602



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#13602



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Not Important



#13602



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Embed universal design principles and accessibility as a not negotiable in all aspects of Council process, projects, renewal programmes and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13639**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Continue with previously planned initiatives specifically raised pedestrian crossings and cycleways.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Subsidised public transport to improve frequency on utilised routes eg ferries.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other





#13639



Tell us here:

Look to the successful Tauranga port model

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#13639

<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	I don't know
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know



#13639



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined	Very Important



#13639



in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

More sport stadiums

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Environmental and cultural



**#13651**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

One size doesn't fit all, flexibility is the key.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

NZ perceived as a sport-oriented country, however lack of sport facilities support is a real concern.

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Environmental and cultural have done enough their own good cause.

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

NH stadium constantly left unused, let's revamp for other users' purposes and increase usage.

### 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:

Fair call



**#13651**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#13651



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	





#13651



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support any priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important



#13651



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Focus should be laid on boosting productivity and return on investment.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#13651**



How many people are going to read/loan/borrow hardcopy books/magazines/newspapers in the coming decades? Let's get real and focus on economic returns.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Soft plastic recycling.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Food scraps bins.



**#13659**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Other

**Tell us why:**

Seems like the cheaper option. Whichever involves the least spending. \$3.3M/year is a lot for something not everyone uses.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Selling the city's assets and not everyone will reap the benefits.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#13659**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Again stop selling the city's assets and still increasing rates. Lose lose for rate payers.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#13659



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#13659



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important





#13659



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Don't build it If you can't afford. Libraries are becoming redundant with information readily available online.



**#13659**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I would like the council to do and spend more in the areas of Public Transport, Active Transport, Water Quality and Environment. I support further investment in our public transport system. This includes investment in surface light rail and busways. Any busway development along the North-Western corridor should be future-proofed for



**#13675**



surface light rail upgrades. Other popular bus corridors such as dominion road should also be considered for surface light rail.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

I want Auckland Council to spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode. We are not going to solve our congestion problems by building more lanes or further incentivising private vehicle usage.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I want Auckland Council to spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as cycleways.

I want Auckland Council to spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable.

I want Auckland Council to spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

Auckland Council's Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway sets out actions required to reduce the region's transport emissions by 64% by the year 2030. Transport is the biggest emitter contributing to over 40% of the region's total emissions. Within the transport emissions, 86% come from road transport. This sets a clear directive. We need to get people out of private cars, into buses, trains and ferries and onto cycleways. Failing to understand and action this will result in a continuation of over investment in roading projects and underinvestment in the public and active transport networks. The evidence is there and the evidence is clear.

Regarding the Mayoral proposal, I am encouraged to see initiatives to make public transport more accessible, such as the \$50 weekly cap and introduction of diverse payment options. Another positive is the work programmes which look to improve public transport services, such as network optimisation, expansion of the electric train fleet and completion of the City Rail Link. Unfortunately, alongside these positives, there are some concerns. A couple of examples are; the removal of 'low performing' bus services, and the several references to roading focused projects.



**#13675**



As well as continuing to invest and improve our public transport network, it is essential that the Council urgently supports the transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.

Cutting “low-value initiatives, including raised pedestrian crossings and expensive gold-plated cycleways” is an ideological move that fails to align with the Council's own Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway. In monetary terms, this means cutting funding for cycleways by \$141.5 million. This makes no sense as we know increasing funding for active transport infrastructure is a smart investment that can benefit the economy, the environment, and public health. Cycling is a low-cost, low-carbon and low-impact mode of transport that can reduce congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. Cycling also promotes daily, incidental physical activity, mental wellbeing and social inclusion. By improving the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of walking and cycling, more people will be encouraged to choose it as a regular means of travel, creating a virtuous cycle of benefits. This approach also creates better use of existing roading assets by making space for those who cannot choose cycling, walking or public transport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

I want Auckland Council to spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as cycleways, and raised crossings.

I want Auckland Council to spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable. I also want to see investment in surface light rail for auckland.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

I want Auckland Council to spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**



**#13675**



**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Aucklands airport is a major factor in the economy of this city and the council should have the ability to impact its future.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#13675



**Tell us why:**

With the current layout of the waterfront and public areas around britomart, this area makes more sense for other uses.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

Similar to above reasons, with the popularity of the waterfront and downtown areas, this area makes sense for public use in the long term.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>



#13675



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour





#13675



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

I think these priorities are good. In general i believe the board should be focused on climate and environmental action as well as supporting our community. A bigger focus



**#13675**



on active and public transport modes is important. I believe that better connections between the upper harbour board is important as well. The 120 was proposed to be upgraded to the 12 service as part of the WX upgrades. This was unfortunately cut from the upgrades. Having better service on this highly used line would better connect the upper harbor community.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

I have used the library facilities at albany and found them great. I do not support selling any facilities. I am unsure if new facilities should be our top priority but generally support Library funding and facilities.

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Waste management such as food scrap bins



**#13687**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Cycleways

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The Stadium has so much potential to become a major event centre. As it is in the midst of a culturally diverse community, they should consider options for other sports including indoor facilities for badminton, volleyball, basketball, and the like (similar to the Central Energy Trust Arena in Palmerston North). These are gaining wider popularity now and could even gain international audiences.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#13687**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#13687



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#13687



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#13687



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13690**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#13690



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual</p>	<p>Support</p>



#13690



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



**#13690**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#13706



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that</p>	<p>Support</p>





#13706



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



#13706



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important



#13706



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Building roads. I don't think more roads will solve issues of congestion, rather continue investment into public transport.



**#13708**



## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support most of the proposal

### Tell us why:

I do not support the removal of the fuel tax, but I do support much investment into making public transport more affordable, effective and reliable.

### 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

I really think the recent decisions to increase prices for public transport are a step backwards, and I think continued investment in public transport, while expensive in the short run, will really be beneficial to the city in the long term, reducing congestion and increasing quality of living

### 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

### Tell us why:

I think the Stadium is a crucial part of the community, but it could also benefit from improved management, which helps alleviate some budget but also keeps most of the benefits the Stadium provides.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#13708**



I think this seems like a reasonable way to create a good buffer and mean we do not have to increase rates too much, and alleviate cost of living pressure a little bit.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

I think it has some good potential for both public and economic benefit in the long run.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#13708



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#13708



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important





#13708



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I am strongly in favour of actions that prioritise community spaces and creation of both more environmentally and socially friendly areas. I think these two objectives go well together and have huge long term benefits for everyone.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

It seems like funding is a major barrier to many objectives we want to achieve, so I agree that some things may need to be deprioritised due to budget constraints. I think getting funding to maintain current important assets are important, and then using remaining budget to start investment into quality spaces of living is the logical next step.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#13708**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13830**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#13830



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#13830



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#13830



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#13830**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

- Public Transport - Ensure public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable, prioritising investment in public transport infrastructure over road spending.
- Active Transport - Urgently transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.



**#13846**



- Water Quality - Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.
- Environment and Regulation - Ensure appropriate funding is allocated to increase monitoring activity of current/active and future resource consents to enable better environmental outcomes.

As well as the options provided in the structured consultation, I would also like the Council to do more of the following:

- Protecting and working with communities by continuing to prioritise the funding and delivery of Making Space for Water in partnership with Central Government.
- Ensuring adequate support for community and social services, including contestable grants (such as the Climate Action Grant), the Live Lightly programme, the Communities in Need programme, and supporting work on Council land and marae. This can be achieved by re-establishing pre-2023/2024 budget funding for these areas.
- Supporting frontline, volunteer powered communities by ensuring local boards are adequately funded and grants are available. Grants and investment into community-led services provide great value to Aucklanders. For every dollar that Council invests we get back many more volunteer hours.
- Supporting moves to a circular economy and zero waste, ensuring waste materials are seen as resources to be reused, repaired, repurposed and recycled, and are diverted from landfill.

**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

- Lowering emissions by becoming a leader in localised renewable energy generation by enabling local integrated energy solutions to support community owned energy groups.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#13846**



Auckland Council's Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway sets out actions required to reduce the region's transport emissions by 64% by the year 2030. Transport is the biggest emitter contributing to over 40% of the region's total emissions. Within the transport emissions, 86% come from road transport. This sets a clear directive. We need to get people out of private cars, into buses, trains and ferries and onto cycleways. Failing to understand and action this will result in a continuation of over investment in roading projects and underinvestment in the public and active transport networks. The evidence is there and the evidence is clear.

Regarding the Mayoral proposal, I am encouraged to see initiatives to make public transport more accessible, such as the \$50 weekly cap and introduction of diverse payment options. Another positive is the work programmes which look to improve public transport services, such as network optimisation, expansion of the electric train fleet and completion of the City Rail Link. Unfortunately, alongside these positives, there are some concerns. A couple of examples are; the removal of 'low performing' bus services, and the several references to roading focused projects.

As well as continuing to invest and improve our public transport network, it is essential that the Council urgently supports the transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.

Cutting "low-value initiatives, including raised pedestrian crossings and expensive gold-plated cycleways" is an ideological move that fails to align with the Council's own Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway. In monetary terms, this means cutting funding for cycleways by \$141.5 million. This makes no sense as we know increasing funding for active transport infrastructure is a smart investment that can benefit the economy, the environment, and public health. Cycling is a low-cost, low-carbon and low-impact mode of transport that can reduce congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. Cycling also promotes daily, incidental physical activity, mental wellbeing and social inclusion. By improving the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of walking and cycling, more people will be encouraged to choose it as a regular means of travel, creating a virtuous cycle of benefits. This approach also creates better use of existing roading assets by making space for those who cannot choose cycling, walking or public transport

## **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable. spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as



**#13846**



cycleways. spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#13846



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#13846



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Re-establish the full funding of the Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.

Revenue gained from NETR affects the delivery of essential projects to protect our biodiversity and taonga species. For example, the rate funds kauri dieback track upgrades, treatment support for landowners with kauri dieback, monitoring of the health of our forests and education for visitors to prevent further spread of the disease and predator control on our islands and the mainland. This work supports the health of our environment, which we need to be healthy to keep humans healthy, by filtering our water, catching and intercepting rainfall, holding our soils and slopes together and cleaning our air. Having spent years with large parts of the track network closed to protect kauri it is important to ensure this work continues as planned to enable safe



#13846



access to our wild places, which are so important for our mental and physical health, and the health of our forests.

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

Other

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	



#13846



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

- Funding and support for community driven environmental work (e.g., habitat restoration, plant and animal pest control).
- Funding and support for community groups that focus on climate action (e.g., waste, active transport, education, etc).
- Growth of

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

Grants and investment into community services provide great value to Aucklanders. For every dollar that the council invests we get back many more volunteer hours. Many boards invest a significant amount into support for local community conservation to pro

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Remove all obstructions to traffic flow (cycleways pdx etc.) Drastically reduce influence of CCO especially AT and panuka Decentralise control of parks and ccommunity facilities to appropriately fund local boards

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13871**



Reduce beauracracy at all levels of control especially AT, eke Panuku and Auckland University are oversized and underperforming/out of touch with Aucklands requirements

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Private motor vehicles will continue to provide majority of public (illegible) (illegible) Auckland Facilitate park/ride hubs and spoke and wheel transport around public transport- smaller buses to city and larger on xpress spoke route

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Park and ride facilities to facilitate/enocourage public to access buses/trains ferry infrastructure

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce AT to a coordinating agency. Privatisise buses both control as required. Integrate ferries into transport network

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

### **Tell us why:**

Before council CCO control it was a functional and active amenity. Under it has died put it back under active, independent management Bear in mind rising soccer/football need a home. Do not sell

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#13871**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

But don't sell shares. Future fund should aggregate infrastructure shares as NZ receivers (illegible). No C.C.O for future fund should be run by progressive service control with minimum service requirements (illegible)

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Use 75% of funds for future fund around 20-25% for debt reduction + infrastructure works outstanding

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

See above split returns 50/50 between future fund and council services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Do not agree with self insurance proposal. A year like last one would wipe out years of fund earnings and possibly fund (illegible)

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**



#13871



No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Because Auckland council has much higher priorities for infrastructure than embarking on new projects with these assets at this time

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

As above focus on regional transport privatisation and integration . Get rid of the fat in C.C.Os first complete control (illegible) and restructure of regional transport to HBB/spoke system using contracted public service providers

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#13871



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour



#13871



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

#### Tell us why

### 7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?



**#13871**



**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

C.C.O model is broken/unsustainable. Should not be stand alone but department of council. Abolish cco boards appoint councillors to cco boards. Make cco directly responsible to AKL council



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do less
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Decentralise control of parks and local community facilities to appropriately funded boards >local Remove all traffic calming measures-obstruction. Drastically reduce influence of Panuku and AT supposed to be CCOs not OCCs

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#13877**



Stop impeding traffic flow. Stop bulding cycle lanes esp stupid raised crossings reduce bureaucracy in council AT/Auckland unlimited overstuffed/underperforming

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Private m/v's will continue to provide Aucklanders travel needs buses and ferries not reliable enough

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

smaller buses

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Privatise services, buses and ferries

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Before Auckland unlimited got control from council (gift) the stadium was well functional/ well used. Do not sell built and funded by local residents

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#13877**



No CCO for future fund. We need a professionally run fun- use NZ super annuation as example

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

At least we still own. Use 70% of funds to fund future project and pay down debt

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Split the retures 50/50 future fund and council services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Don't agree with self insurance. The risk to the future is too great

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Auckland council has much higher priorities for new infrastructure including NO waterfront stadium



#13877



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

The thing needed is more trucks on already congested and fragile city roads

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know



#13877



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**



#13877



Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#13877**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Anbolish CCOs and appoint councillors to council communitites CCOs should not be standalone-save huge dollars



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#13887**



**Tell us why:**

I do NOT support the proposal to introduce parking charges at park and rides.

We are trying to encourage people on public transport and car share. This would do the exact opposite.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**





#13887



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#13887



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#13957**



To remove the people at the top of AT they are not worth the money that they are being paid and to reduce the number of road cones. There is no need to have a road cone every 2 metres or the number of people putting them out

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

AT has got out of hand at the top and needs to be replaced with people that know what they're doing

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

A proper pedestrian crossing on Clarke Street Hobsonville so that 80-100 people can cross not to mention the local community that can make use of it.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

There's plenty of money for a rainbow crossing but none for a little bit of white paint to save children's lives

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#13957**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#13957



6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#13957



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	



#13957



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Maintain current facilities well

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Too many free events are organised at cost of having a huge team manage them.



**#13991**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Too many large buses travelling empty or nearly empty round the city.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

small shuttle buses would be preferable

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

stop using most of the large expensive buses

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Do not get rid of facilities that are already in short supply. Employ an independent and skilled management to run the facilities

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Distribution of funds. But ensure that successive councils cannot deplete investment by paying off debt and rather use dividends to contribute towards development.



**#13991**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

distribution of funds will also reduce the number of employees at council who oversee management of the ports

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

The AFF would produce dividends to fund services

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

No

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

If you proceed there will be more revenue generating development.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#13991



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#13991



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

No

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3	



#13991



sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#13991**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Other

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

We must prioritise looking after our people and planet by investing in the things that provide us with life’s essentials, such as fresh air, clean drinking water, hazard resilient landscapes and basic needs, like accessible transport and a sustainable waste network.

Where I’d like Auckland Council to do/spend more





**#13993**



- Public Transport - Ensure public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable, prioritising investment in public transport infrastructure over road spending.
- Active Transport - Urgently transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.
- Water Quality - Re-establish the full funding of the Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR) to pre-2023/2024 budget levels to ensure delivery and growth of related work programmes.
- Ecologically focused management of Public Space: Reverse cuts to services that keep our parks and reserves clear of waste and rubbish; reduce mowing with heavy machinery that compacts soil, and increase ecologically appropriate planting.
- Environment and Regulation - Ensure appropriate funding is allocated to increase monitoring activity of current/active and future resource consents to enable better environmental outcomes.

As well as the options provided in the structured consultation, I would also like the Council to do more of the following:

- Protecting and working with communities by continuing to prioritise the funding and delivery of Making Space for Water in partnership with Central Government.
- Ensuring adequate support for community and social services, including contestable grants (such as the Climate Action Grant), the Live Lightly programme, the Communities in Need programme, and supporting work on Council land and marae. This can be achieved by re-establishing pre-2023/2024 budget funding for these areas.
- Supporting frontline, volunteer powered communities by ensuring local boards are adequately funded and grants are available. Grants and investment into community-led services provide great value to Aucklanders. For every dollar that Council invests we get back many more volunteer hours.
- Supporting moves to a circular economy and zero waste, ensuring waste materials are seen as resources to be reused, repaired, repurposed and recycled, and are diverted from landfill.
- Lowering emissions by becoming a leader in localised renewable energy generation by enabling local integrated energy solutions to support community owned energy groups.



#13993



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Auckland Council's Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway sets out actions required to reduce the region's transport emissions by 64% by the year 2030. Transport is the biggest emitter contributing to over 40% of the region's total emissions. Within the transport emissions, 86% come from road transport. This sets a clear directive. We need to get people out of private cars, into buses, trains and ferries and onto cycleways. Failing to understand and action this will result in a continuation of over investment in roading projects and underinvestment in the public and active transport networks. The evidence is there and the evidence is clear.

Regarding the Mayoral proposal, I am encouraged to see initiatives to make public transport more accessible, such as the \$50 weekly cap and introduction of diverse payment options. Another positive is the work programmes which look to improve public transport services, such as network optimisation, expansion of the electric train fleet and completion of the City Rail Link. Unfortunately, alongside these positives, there are some concerns. A couple of examples are; the removal of 'low performing' bus services, and the several references to roading focused projects.

As well as continuing to invest and improve our public transport network, it is essential that the Council urgently supports the transition towards low emissions communities by prioritising and increasing, not reducing, investment in walking and cycling infrastructure.

Cutting "low-value initiatives, including raised pedestrian crossings and expensive gold-plated cycleways" is an ideological move that fails to align with the Council's own Transport Emissions Reduction Pathway. In monetary terms, this means cutting funding for cycleways by \$141.5 million. This makes no sense as we know increasing funding for active transport infrastructure is a smart investment that can benefit the economy, the environment, and public health. Cycling is a low-cost, low-carbon and low-impact mode of transport that can reduce congestion, pollution, and greenhouse gas emissions. Cycling also promotes daily, incidental physical activity, mental wellbeing and social inclusion. By improving the safety, accessibility and attractiveness of walking and cycling, more people will be encouraged to choose it as a regular



**#13993**



means of travel, creating a virtuous cycle of benefits. This approach also creates better use of existing roading assets by making space for those who cannot choose cycling, walking or public transport.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

spend more on safe, accessible, and attractive active transport infrastructure such as cycleways.

spend more on ensuring public transport is affordable, accessible, and reliable.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

spend less on new roading projects that prioritise private vehicles as the primary transport mode.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#13993



Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to	Support



#13993



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour



#13993



## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

### 7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

Other

#### More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

#### Tell us why

I support the following local board priorities (other):

- Funding and support for the Upper Waitemata Ecology Network and the Auckland Council Community Ranger Program.



**#13993**



- Delivering outcomes in the Upper Harbour Greenways Strategy.
- Enhancing Maintenance

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#14491**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#14491



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#14491



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	I don't know
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



#14491



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Franklin, Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I do not support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	



**#14491**



Tell us why

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#14634**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Better opportunities but using a lot of money and time on this one

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

no

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

no

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

There's no real reason to change the precinct of the stadium right now

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Awesome opportunities for the community effect of today's generation

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



**#14634**



**Tell us here:**

safer option with less changes/wait times

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Keep it how it is because it

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

less time used on irrelevant changes

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

it's fine where it is

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**





#14634



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#14634



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	



#14634



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

some awesome ideas and opportunities. Priorities could be looked at again but some some awesome things put into place

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#14634**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Natural collections

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#14673**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**



#14673



Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by</p>	



#14673



businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

n/a

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

tax



**#14739**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

doesn't apply

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

n/a

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

cost of living

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

n/a

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



#14739



**Tell us here:**

stadium

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

do the stadium

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

stadium

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in	
---	--



#14739



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	



**#14739**



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#14744**



Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

too messy

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

cost of living

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

stadium



#14744



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

food for poor

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Beach

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

Stadium

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Other





#14744



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Other</p>



**#14744**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Public transport



**#14752**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

tax

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

stadium



#14752



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

I don't know

Tell us here:

just split it

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Other

Tell us why:

new beach

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

stadium

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

I don't know



#14752



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Other</p>



**#14752**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): Business North Harbour Incorporated

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#14772**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

BNH agrees that a key priority for transport should be to make the most of Council's existing

assets and planned spend, including the Council's significant investment in the City Rail Link (CRL)

and other large rapid transit network projects. To enable BIDs to support Council and their

members, we ask that all transport projects are planned and implemented following consultation

with and in close collaboration with any affected BIDs. A key concern BNH has is the disruption

caused to business from transport developments, including often excessive temporary traffic

management which is doubtless a significant cost to Council. We ask for this to be addressed as

it will benefit affected businesses and will also assist Council in its efforts to find cost savings.

We support the particular focus on renewals and maintenance to ensure roads and other network

assets are kept in good order and there be a total capital spend of \$13.4 billion for Auckland

Transport to address these priorities. BNH also supports a new focus on smaller-scale changes to

more quickly improve the performance of our roads and public transport services, including the

provision of dynamic lanes and bus lanes.

Making public transport faster, more reliable and easier to use is also supported as is rapid transit

investment, focused on busways (following the successful example of the Northern Busway).



**#14772**



Transport investment for emissions reduction, such as the ongoing addition of electric vehicles to

the bus and ferry fleets is also important to BNH. Getting more people on to public transport will

also help Council to reach its emissions reduction target.

Ensuring maximum value from every dollar spent is a given for BNH, as is driving efficiencies and

managing operating costs.

One concern BNH has along with Council is the recent government decision to cancel the Regional

Fuel Tax (RFT), ending the scheme four years early. We are concerned that this has resulted in a

reduction in the level of investment in and re-prioritisation of transport projects in the Long Term

Plan 2024-2034. BNH is also keen to see the detailed plans for congestion charging/time of use

charging, so that we can assess the implications for businesses relative to the timelines involved.

Adding further complexity is the recent release of the draft Government Policy Statement on land

transport 2024.3

In particular, this reintroduces the Roads of National Significance programme

(including for Auckland, Mill Road and the East West Link). The introduction of legislation for the

fast tracking of consents for major infrastructure, including the Roads of National Significance and

rapid transit projects,<sup>4</sup> brings further opportunity, but BNH believes that an alignment of national

and regional priorities needs to be established and asks Council to be proactive on this topic.



**#14772**



**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

BNH supports Option 2 under which it is proposed that Council redevelop the North Harbour

Stadium precinct to better deliver for the needs of the North Shore community, funded through

reallocation of the \$33 million and the sale of some currently unused stadium precinct land, while

retaining the existing community playing fields. We understand that other external funding will likely be necessary to achieve the redevelopment. BNH believes that the operational management

of the stadium should be changed to ensure greater use of the facilities by the community.<sup>8</sup>

It is also our belief that there is no need to reinvent the wheel as the current stadium should be

adapted to produce a fit for purpose facility that the North Shore community with its growing

population needs. We would also stress that any redevelopment must not result in the loss of any

fields or other areas/land currently being used, with the sale of any land being confined to unused

land in the precinct.

BNH would also note that any change of operational management of the stadium must ensure



**#14772**



that whoever is ultimately responsible for the running of the stadium is dedicated to optimising the use of the facility which, if the redevelopment is effective, should include a multitude of stakeholders including the local business community.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

As we set out below, whilst BNH supports establishing the Auckland Future Fund with the Auckland

International Airport shareholding, we do not support an operating lease of Port of Auckland.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Overall, BNH supports Option 3 - Auckland Future Fund with AIAL shares only. We do not support

a lease of the Port operation.

There are several reasons why BNH does not support a lease of the Port operations.

First, the various reports commissioned on the future of the Port of Auckland have reached the

same conclusion that the Port will outgrow its present site in 20-30 years.<sup>11</sup> Also, the capacity



**#14772**



constraints are not limited to the Port itself. The reports agree that the road and rail networks

that service the Port will need significant upgrading to improve connectivity and integration. As a

consequence, locking the Port into a lease of around 35 years does not seem to align with the

need to integrate transport links or shift the Port in 20-30 years, or provide the flexibility necessary for these decisions.

Further, in recent decades the city centre has transformed dramatically and the area around the

Port has become an important commercial and residential centre in its own right. There are

differing stakeholder aspirations for the area leading to tensions between the growth in freight

volumes on the one hand and increasing residential and recreational use of the waterfront on the

other. One hundred per cent ownership of POAL and the land on the Auckland waterfront means

Council can better manage the differing stakeholder aspirations and requirements.

In addition, the privatisation of the Port will likely mean Auckland businesses would end up paying

increased costs to deliver profits to a private port operator (who will have a monopoly). Major

price hikes from private terminal operators have led to concerns recently in Australia. BNH has

concerns that any financial benefits from the lease will be outweighed by increased costs for

businesses and consumers. Moreover, the Port of Auckland has recently seen a major turnaround

under new management producing increased dividends for Council



#14772



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

See attachment

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

See attachment

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

See attachment

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	



#14772



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	



#14772



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

See attachment

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	





#14772



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

See attachment

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

See attachment

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

See attachment



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Nothing at all

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Nothing



**#14889**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

because it'll help with less cars on the road helping with traffic delays

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

because there's always room for change in bettering the operations/engagement of their community for better adaptations and development for the company overall

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It seems like a great investment from my perspective

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know



**#14889**



**Tell us here:**

not too sure about this one

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

I see great outcomes coming out of the future fund practically investing into the betterment of multiple groups of Auckland

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

No real need, so why change it?

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

it seems fine where it is now



#14889



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#14889



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	



#14889



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	

**Tell us why**

I Support majority because they displayed great models of future thinking goals and projects to better the community of Auckland as a whole.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#14889**



8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15396**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15396



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15396



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15397**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15397



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15397



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15399**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15399



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15399



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15402**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15402



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15402



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15403**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15403



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15403



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15404**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15404



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15404



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Better allocation and utilisation of \$ they do have.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Beautifying areas / street, installing pedestrian crossings,



**#15489**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Pot holes, repair roads once and do it right rather than shoddy job several times

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Pedestrian crossings

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15489



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

Self insurance - is it a risk worth taking, will the savings really amount to a sum that will make a difference (or be used wisely)

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#15489

around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know



#15489



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

Targeted rates need to show outcomes or be scrapped

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate	Fairly Important



#15489



change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

The local boards know their patches and should be given more autonomous control of how \$ spent in their areas.

Priority: Roading / Congestion Flood prevention / waterway maintenance Build infrastructure BEFORE approving housing developments

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Trust the local board although the upper harbour area is very wide and very diverse so many items not applicable to me (or not on my top priority list)

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate



**#15489**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I don't know

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. I don't know

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): North Shore City Baseball Club

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#15498**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15498



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15498



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

We submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.

We submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.



**#15498**



We submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

We support the following aspects of the consultation:

- We support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- We propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- We propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.
- We advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- We support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- We support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- We advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Speed reduction and more cycleways

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#15508**



Less consultants and kerb council management salaries increasesincreases and set

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#15508



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Support



#15508



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	





#15508



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important



#15508



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments What does this mean? Generally faster is not better and rarely cheaper in long run

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88,

Comments



**#15508**



11 Other Ethnicities - For “other ethnicities” (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them.

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable): North Harbour Softball Association

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15513**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15513



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15513



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

I am/We are part of the sport and recreation sector in Auckland. Our sector is critical in making Auckland a great place to be. We rely on hard working volunteers and build strong communities – Council’s support is critical to enable our sector to achieve what it does.

I/We submit that the proposed option to pay less and do less will detrimentally impact the play, active recreation and sport sector.



**#15513**



I/ We submit that the Central proposal for the overall direction of Council's Long-term Plan appropriately balance rates rises with service delivery.

I/ We submit that the Central proposal for Parks and Community will continue to provide a better outcome for the sport and recreation sector.

I/ We support the following aspects of the consultation:

- I/We support retaining the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund and the strongly support the proposal for \$35 million of additional funding being added to the Fund.
- I/We propose that Council refines the criteria of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Investment Fund to make the additional funding non-contestable.
- I/We propose that the additional \$35 million funding is used to fund a range of community sport and recreation facilities including, but not limited to, indoor sports facilities.
- I/We advocate for the retention of the Sport and Recreation Facilities Operating Grant and ask consideration for an increase to the Grant.
- I/We support Council seeking changes to the law relating to development contributions to enable Council to adequately recover the costs of growth and to use development contributions to fund community sport and recreation facilities.
- I/We support a review of costs and contractual structure for maintenance on parks and open spaces, specifically for sports fields.
- I/We advocate for community use of schools and that consideration given to the co-development of schools with Auckland Council to include publicly accessible sport and recreation facilities.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Road network. Links to already existing infrastructure that would ease congestion and assist flow. eg an off ramp northbound on SH18 at Squadron Drive to reduce bottle neck on Brigham Creek Rd at Hobsonville Rd. Also the marking of second lane westbound on SH16 from Brigham/Fred Taylor through to Old North Rd where road is wide enough but only single lane and chronic bottleneck in peak times



**#15538**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Bus lanes. The constant introduction of bus only lanes reduce the road network capacity for vehicles effectively doubling the traffic congestion such as on Onewa Rd. Whilst buses are an integral part of a public transport network, they are not the only solution and cannot be used by everyone. A large percentage of occupations cannot use buses for commuting eg. tradespeople, sales and service industries, deliveries etc.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I do not support dynamic lanes, time of use schemes, nor the so called "safety" program of raised crossings and humps all over town, especially on main arterial roads.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Road improvements - create an off ramp from SH16 at Northside Dve (where there is a partly built overpass) to cater for Costco traffic that frequently banks back on the Hobsonville exit onto motorway causing major safety hazard. This would also reduce congestion in and around Westgate and North West shopping precinct. Additionally, creating a connection from SH16 onto SH18 northbound would remove up to 90% of traffic from Brigham Creek Rd and away from the school zone.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Buses. AC are all about user pays EXCEPT when it comes to buses. 32% of our rates go toward transport which is spent on subsidising buses and their networks. Buses should be user pays.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management



**#15538**



**Tell us why:**

North Harbour Stadium WAS a great stadium and held lots of great and well attended events UNTIL the creation of the "supercity" and TAU took over. Since then it has been partly demolished, lacked events and allowed to dilapidate into disrepair. The stadium was largely paid for by ratepayers who also fundraised to get this crown jewel of the North built. TAU should be made to restore the stadium to its pervious status and hand over operation to the previous North Harbour Stadium Trust that ran it. In NO WAY should this facility be demolished, in part or in full. Auckland is growing rapidly and needs MORE facilities like this, not less.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

Do not sell off income generating assets. Retain airport shares.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

If leasing the ports for UP TO 25 years will generate more income over time than maintaining operation of them, then this could be considered.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#15538



**Tell us here:**

By 'investing' in the future fund, there would be a greater shortfall in income to fund current activities. Seems ridiculous when we are already short of funding to redirect some elsewhere.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Self insurance could be a wise move provided full risk assessment is carried out and liabilities minimised.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

There is only value in changing ownership IF an alternative use or development of the land is proposed, viable and realistic. There is no point taking back one or all of these facilities if there is no plan AND no funding for their development. Personally

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Bledisloe is currently used largely for vehicle imports and is an integral part of the ports operations. Again, unless there is a specific development that is both realistic and funded I don't see any point in changing ownership or use of this area.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Do not support



#15538



<p>increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Support



#15538



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Support

Strongly support the uniform rates funded refuse collection. Areas with current pay as you throw only encourages public dumping of rubbish in either public bins or on council land, which in turn is born by ratepayers to clean up anyway.

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important



#15538



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Strongly support most of the UHLB priorities.

The long term plan, whilst high level and very generalised, fails to address necessary cost cutting in inefficiencies within the council and it's services. Whilst not the highest average rates in the country,

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Strongly support the Albany multi use library, similar to the Westgate library facility.  
Strongly support the public toilet at Parkhouse reserve - should have been built when park was first developed and paid for by the developers (Fletcher Living etc)

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate**



#15538



following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments There are numerous inefficiencies within council, and all areas need a thorough cost cutting assessment to establish what resources are underutilised or undercharged. I commend all moves to reduce waste, ensure efficiency and accountability.

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments Absolutely, ESPECIALLY when it comes to Auckland Transport.

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree

Comments I agree in principal to most of the listed focus points. However, in an economic climate where other services are being cut and scaled back, similar reductions need to be made across the board and the priority of some of the focus points questioned.

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments This is something I support wholeheartedly - whilst the general (perceived) focus is on a bi-cultural society (pakeha & Maori) the fact is that many other cultures make up the identity of Aucklanders and in some cases outnumber particularly maori and the focus should indeed be on multi-cultural society, encompassing ALL ethnicities.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15557**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#15557



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#15557



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Parks & local amenities

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Money should be spent equally between the ethnic groups



**#15583**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Too many buses are empty so put smaller buses with more frequent timetable in the suburban areas

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15583



Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#15583

around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	I don't know





#15583



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Very Important



#15583



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money    Yes, I agree

Comments



**#15583**



9 Priorities - 4.Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations,and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Sewage connections through Whenuapai. Reducing bureaucracy for households to switch to new age septic tanks, ie, don’t have to pay building consent/ resource consent costs when making improvements at a property that is beneficial for the environment of waterways as a whole.



**#15614**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Cycleways, \$100,000 library curtains, materialistic show pieces, being more respectful overall for ratepayers money.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

There is no benefit to our community especially with all the development that's occurred. Central govt needs to connect SH18 and SH16 so that Brighams Creek Road is no longer used to connect these for North Shore traffic heading to Kumeu and beyond.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Better preparation, depth of asphalt to ensure roads are more resilient and get less pot holes over time

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal



**#15614**



**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Option 1

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#15614



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#15614



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important





#15614



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

Whenuapai needs sewage. We are rated as Urban Residential and need to have services that reflect the rating. Brigham Creek Road needs to stop being used as a main thoroughfare. Kauri Road needs a footpath.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

I don't understand what many mean and the implications so I've put I don't know. I can't say very, fairly, not without further context and more information on what these are.

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**



**#15614**



**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I don't know

Comments There is a lot of money being spent without improved outcomes. No trickle down effect.

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. I don't know

Comments What do you mean? I didn't see anything in the plan about this?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15641**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I do not support the potential for charges for park n ride where it is deemed that there is sufficient tributary buses. Cars are likely to come from all around the region and not necessarily on an existing line. The service from Whenuapai to the North Shore is non-existent and so the park n ride is essential. I support the proposed \$50 weekly cap for public transport and an annual card - this is in line with international standards. I do not support the removal of the Gold Card users subsidy from 3.00 - 6.30 pm. This could be modified to 5 - 6pm if the costs savings were worthwhile. I couldn't see the evidence of what the costs savings were that would make such a proposal worthy of consideration.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Footpaths along Kauri Road Whenuapai. People could walk to the supermarket and other amenities now at Hobsonville but Kauri Road is dangerous to walk and definitely not appropriate for families.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#15641**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**



#15641



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#15641



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

Rates Funded Refuse Collection - I only put out my bin once a month due to recycling, composting and reuse. I am sure there are many others who act similarly so prefer the 'pay as you throw' which is fairer

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	I don't know
--	--------------



#15641



Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know





**#15641**



**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I don't know

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15661**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The port has members that will sustain and maintain operations. they also have plans that will succeed for the betterment of the port.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



#15661



Tell us here:

The funding generated by the port should be invested in the port.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to	



#15661



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#15661**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Buses to Herald Island. Footpath on kauri road

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#15672**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Footpath and/or bike lanes on Kauri Road

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Develop so concerts Can held there

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

No asset sales

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other





#15672



Tell us here:

Move the port to Miranda

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This

Support



#15672

increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know



#15672



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#15672



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#15672**



## 8. Do you have any other comments?

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments Focus on improving public transport. Herald Island needs a bus. WX1 is good but needs to not share the motorway with cars. Take it to Kumeu. Northwest is at a standstill.

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Increasing public transport. If public transport was more reliable and efficient more people would use it and therefore council would get more money. I can't take the bus to work from Whenuapai because the buses to Westgate to take the bus to the city are not frequent enough



**#15769**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

Wayne Brown's lawyer fees

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



#15769



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

Tell us here:

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Support





#15769



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#15769



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Very Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important



#15769



Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#15769**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15802**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#15802



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15802



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

NOTHING. Simply use available money well. Focus on customer/service centric outcomes and STOP THE WASTEFUL SPENDING!

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#15826**



Increased rates are NOT NEEDED! Work MUCH Smarter and STOP THE WASTE. Start doing the right activity, at the right place, at the right time, and with the right risk/opportunity.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Start becoming accountable for the delivery of fundamental maintenance and the right level of service for customer needs.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

AT does NOT NEED additional money. Start spending MUCH smarter

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

STOP all the waste! There is simply so much scope for enhanced productivity, and performance.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#15826**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Other

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#15826



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Other</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#15826



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - Do not Support

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important



#15826



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Not Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Not Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#15826**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Bring the stadium back up to standards and make it useable for groups that need the grounds and the size. Go back to the previous management which knew how to bring in events that brought revenue to the stadium. It can be made profitable again.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

It would be unwise for Auckland to sell off its assets like the airport shares and the port. Proceed with leasing the port to bring in revenue from an ongoing asset.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund



**#15886**



**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Couldn't some of the funds be used to fund council services and some invest in the Future Fund. We DO need to invest for future emergency needs, such as we had with the storm and flooding and slips; council needs to save as people do, some here, some there.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#15886



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#15886



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important



#15886



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land and introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#15886**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I don't know

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15921**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**





#15921



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#15921



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15933**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#15933



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#15933



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

PUBLIC transport - increase options, reduce ferry costs, provide corridors for buses, increase trains speed and connections. PUBLIC PARKS AND AMENITIES. ARTS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.



**#15948**



**1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?**

PRIVATE transport - reduce spending on actions that favors individual drivers

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

PUBLIC transport - increase options, reduce ferry costs, provide corridors for buses, increase trains speed and connections.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

PRIVATE transport - reduce spending on actions that favors individual drivers

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Give operational management back to the local people that used to do it before AC took over. Let the local board prioritize the budget. Do NOT sell land or assets related to the stadium.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding





**Tell us why:**

Keep the assets (shares). Do NOT create a new cost to sell assets.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

POAL is profitable. Keep it.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

We don't need a fund. We need AC to provide better and more services to Auckland community.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Keep the assets. Do NOT exchange long by short term gain

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#15948



The possibility of transforming these areas in new residential property is unacceptable.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

Auckland traffic is bad enough. I don't support any action that implies in making it worse. Plus, considering AC should keep POAL operations, reducing it's profitability does not make sense.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Support



#15948



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**



#15948



I support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Not Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

I support Albany multi purpose library if based on a targeted rate for Albany area only. I do NOT support it if based on assets selling.

TOP priority for infrastructure and quality open space in the Whenuapai area, including: - Public toilets and cover

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**



**#15948**



TOP priority for new public toilet facility at the Whenuapai Town Park HIGH priority for continue to prioritise support to our local community organisations and volunteers to deliver outcomes that provide a sense of belonging, wellbeing and resilience for residents

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future I don't know

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15971**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#15971



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	





#15971



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#15976**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The ports of Auckland belong to the ratepayers and should stay that way.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#15976



The profits should go directly into the city of Auckland Services to the public.

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	



#15976



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#15976**



8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16004**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**





#16004



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that	Do not support



#16004



<p>we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	Support



#16004



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support most priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Very Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important



#16004



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Very Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

I don't know

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree

Comments -

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments -

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree



**#16004**



Comments -

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16011**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Privatisation of many public services has often failed dismally across the world. Essential services asset stripped, maintenance not done, then handed back to public ownership to fix again

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16011



Tell us here:

Council has to be run as a business but for the benefit of it's citizens. Proper use of income generating assets should be used to fund public services & hold rate rises to a minimum

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell 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.





#16011



<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#16011**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

council input to events. Make them self funding. Pay for required maintenance work without the large safety cone overhead



**#16037**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

It appears that poor management has caused the under utilization of the stadium. Return the control of the stadium to North Shore organizations that want to make it work.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#16037



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

These wharfs are utilised to support Aucklands commercial activities. I can only see changing this to allow access to the beauty of the harbour to be expensive. Let them remain as working wharfs

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Support



#16037



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	I don't know
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	Support



#16037



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate - I don't know

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I do not support most priorities

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	I don't know
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Not Important



#16037



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

not sure about a need for toilet block at 'Whenuapai Town Park' Isn't it bordered by houses from where people using the park live. Seems like capital and operational costs that aren't needed as home toilets aren't far away, or am I missing something.

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

A targeted rate for Upper Harbour will mean payment by those who will never use it

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money Yes, I agree





**#16037**



Comments

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments We want better outcomes for all Aucklanders. All ethnic groups need to step up to improve themselves.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Less consultants, marketers. Salary stop for public service CEOs and higher management positions.



**#16045**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

More emphasis on public transport, cycle roads and safe pedestrian routes.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

See above comment

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

But do not give up airport stocks.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council



#16045



Tell us here:

4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Other

Tell us here:

Both; use for Council services and invest in fund

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by

Support



#16045



around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025,	Support



#16045



2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

### Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	Fairly Important
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere	Very Important



#16045



Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

Special emphasis on the environment. Please stop cutting down big trees (native and non native) to make room for development ect. Integrate them in a development project instead. These trees are a precious resource and it takes a very long time for trees

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

Environment first. It's about time!

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**



**#16045**



## 8. Do you have any other comments?

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money I don't know

Comments Very populist slogans. What do you mean by 'stop waisting money'? 'Better, faster, cheaper'? How would that work? Faster and cheaper normally does not lead to better...

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future I don't know

Comments Yes, let's make Auckland great again!

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, I don't know

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments We are all New Zealanders. Let's embrace multi diversify.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

infrastructure repairs, maintenance and upgrading

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16054**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Restore and increase bus routes especially in more outlying areas. Sort out a heavy rail link to the Airport

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Abandon light rail.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

The stadium was a very successful and well used facility. It has been allowed to decline under the present management. It is the only good stadium north of the bridge.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The AIAL shares provide a steady dividend income. If they are sold, we might get some short term gain but we have lost that income stream for ever.



**#16054**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The port is an intrinsic part of our city. It provides an income stream which could be improved by greater profitability. The Council will lose any control of the management of the facilities if they are only the landlords to the tenant who is likely to be an offshore company.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Helps to keep rate rises to a reasonable level.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The future fund would be a compulsory savings scheme for future expenses if the Council had surplus funds to support it. The changes to POAL etc. could provide some start funding but would remove the dividend benefit for future generations.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**



#16054



The port is part of Auckland, POAL is the logical manager of that facility.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16054



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Pay as you throw rubbish encourages people to minimize their waste. We need to improve water supply and waste water removal so keep those specific rates. Increase environmental spending so maintain that rate.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?**

I support all priorities



#16054



**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Very Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.	I don't know

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a**



**#16054**



**new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to introduce a targeted rate

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

8 Priorities - 1. Stop wasting money I disagree & have another opinion see below

Comments Auckland citizens need to face up to the cost of running the city. The infrastructure needs major catch up maintenance and development. Rates increases are going to be needed for this and better, faster, cheaper will not provide the savings to achieve this. Good idea to have the better etc. efficiency for everything but it will not solve the deficit.

9 Priorities - 4. Take back control of Council-controlled organisations & Auckland's future Yes, I agree

Comments

10 Leading & Influencing better Outcomes for Maori - Consultation Document for the LTP page 88, Yes, I agree

Comments

11 Other Ethnicities - For "other ethnicities" (i.e. other than Pakaha & Maori) the LTP should recognise the valued input of the rich cultural heritage of the varied immigrant populations, and Endeavour to be inclusive of them. Yes, I agree

Comments



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?





**#16093**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#16093



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#16093



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16263**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

This is good for Auckland and our people, we are profiting for Auckland every week and will only profit more.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services



#16263



Tell us here:

The port makes money for the council every week. This is good for our people

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to	



#16263



reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?



**#16263**



8. Do you have any other comments?





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16265**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

I do not agree to any privatisation of public assets whatsoever!

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**



#16265



4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	



#16265



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16345**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#16345



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#16345



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	
Water	
City and local development	
Environment and regulation	
Parks and Community	
Economic and cultural development	
Council support	

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16346**



**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**



#16346



5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	



#16346



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16423**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#16423



Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Support



#16423



harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know





#16423



6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

## Upper Harbour Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Upper Harbour in 2024/2025?

I support all priorities

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Progress with the detailed business case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany.	Fairly Important
Continue to deliver stage 1b of Te Kori Scott Point which includes physical works for 3 sports fields and sport field lighting as well as a second baseball diamond.	Not Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Ethnic Peoples Plan.	I don't know
Continue to invest in projects that improve the environment and address climate change including planting trees as outlined in the Upper Harbour Urban Ngahere Strategy and continuing to support and fund volunteer environmental work.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Engagement Strategy.	Fairly Important
Implement actions from the Upper Harbour Greenways Plan.	Not Important



#16423



Implement actions from the Upper Harbour  
Wheeled Recreation Service Assessment.

Fairly Important

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Upper Harbour proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**7d. We will prioritise investment in a Detailed Business Case for a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany, however given the financial constraints faced by Auckland Council we would like to explore alternate options to fund any budget shortfalls.**

**We want to hear your views regarding the local board investigating options to sell land or exploring the introduction of a targeted rate to enable investment in building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany (noting that there will be a robust public consultation process on any sale of land or the introduction of a targeted rate following investigation of viable options).**

**Which of the following options do you support?**

Investigate options to sell land

**Do you have any other thoughts or ideas on potential options to fund budget shortfalls associated with building a new multi-purpose library facility in Albany?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is, Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#16439



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual	Support



#16439



<p>programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



**#16439**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introducing more technologies, especially with the rise of AI, to improve work efficiency and service quality.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#16542**



Reduce late-night services, in most areas and on buses, to avoid wastage due to a large number of empty vehicles

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

These transportation infrastructure projects require long investment periods and have slow effects, while also causing pollution.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Enhance the availability of complimentary parking by augmenting the number of parking spaces and enlarging the capacity of parking facilities.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the organizational structure of AT to avoid personnel waste.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

The facilities are outdated, and the surrounding residential structure has changed, making it suitable for redevelopment.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#16542**



**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport are backed by Auckland's long-term financial support, making it unsuitable for short-term investment.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The municipal government-operated enterprises are managed and updated by the city government itself, reflecting citizen participation

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Changing the port infrastructure poses environmental challenges and makes cost control difficult.



#16542



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The location is suitable for developing exhibition venues for large-scale events.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16542



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16544**



Reduce the idle rate of buses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16544**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

There will be significant improvements in all aspects

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits



#16544



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>





#16544



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce unnecessary expenses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets the needs of Auckland, making it easy to manage and implement



**#16545**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#16545



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Support



#16545



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our	
--	--



#16545



community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	These priorities fully reflect the needs of residents and the direction of regional development

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

The city council organization members should be streamlined, reducing the number of managers. We need to save on daily operations. The printing and paper expenses for this accountability are too extravagant, too expensive, and too wasteful. I hope that the





**#16546**



newly established Auckland Future Fund management department is a small, capable, and efficient organization. I don't want it to be a large, valueless entity that only spends money without generating returns. The department hopes to be more altruistic.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree to stop raising pedestrian crossings and bike lanes, but I disagree with removing existing raised roads. It's unnecessary and costly in terms of money, effort, and time.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Currently, the utilization rate is very low, resulting in a lot of waste. We need to make the most of our resources.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#16546**



If the future fund can ensure that the proceeds from selling airport equity generate enough profit, and the net profit exceeds the sum of existing equity returns and future fund operating expenses, then it can proceed. Otherwise, these funds should gradually decrease and eventually disappear. The future fund should be an efficient organization with few personnel but capable of accomplishing much.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I agree with the basic idea, with the condition that the future fund management department must undergo strict scrutiny. It should be efficient, low-cost, and high-yielding. Otherwise, the billions of dollars in funds will gradually decrease year by year, eventually running out, making Auckland even more difficult.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Part of the savings should be used for subsidies, and part should be invested in the Auckland Future Fund.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The city council should maintain the service and ownership of Auckland Port and its land, avoiding short-term gains at the expense of long-term benefits.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know



#16546



**Tell us why:**

There is a need for change, and through this change, we seek greater benefits.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The city council should now explore the possibility of relocating the maritime port to another location, such as a suitable place in southern Auckland. With Auckland's development, the current port should be developed into a more profitable public commercial district. This would beautify the city and generate more revenue.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#16546



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

The current pay-as-you-throw system is reasonable. It also serves as an educational opportunity for citizens about environmental awareness. Businesses, especially foreign enterprises operating locally, profit from doing business here. They have a greater social responsibility.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#16546**



Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Free up more land, reduce the building approval process, improve the efficiency of municipal work, increase oversight channels, and implement punitive measures.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16547**



Climate, reducing carbon emissions, and approval of large-scale projects.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Widen streets and increase expressways

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Construct bicycle lanes, bus-only lanes, and restricted lanes

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Introduce commercialized operations to provide diversified services, reduce public expenditure, and stimulate corporate investment.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16547**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

Reduce government regulation, introduce competition, minimize administrative intervention, and improve efficiency and service quality

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

The port operations have already exerted significant pressure on Auckland's transportation. It's advisable to decentralize logistics to the suburbs to stimulate investment and local employment, and to free up land and transportation capacity in the city c

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years





#16547



Tell us why:

as Q5\_A

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#16547



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do less
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I don't want to pay an extra cent.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16549**



The municipal government can improve efficiency, reduce expenditures, accomplish more practical tasks, with a focus on enhancing efficiency.

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

The expenses are too high. We should adopt a bidding system, which not only emphasizes speed but also ensures quality in construction. Implementing a responsibility system is necessary.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

We don't need to increase expenses in any aspect; instead, we should reduce high-paying employees who are not productive.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Consulting expenses must be canceled.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

Maintenance expenses should be based on a bidding system, openly and transparently. Open bidding for the public. Select teams with low prices, high quality, and reasonable completion periods. Reduce internal malpractice and covert corruption.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**



**#16549**



Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reduce citizen expenditure.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#16549



Tell us why:

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.	Do not support



#16549



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour



**#16549**



**8. Do you have any other comments?**

Increase work efficiency.





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16551**



Reduce the idle rate of buses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16551**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional company management leads to significant improvements in performance and returns

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be strategically utilized across the entire market to maximize their effectiveness

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#16551



**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16551



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16552**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

In Long Bay, mainly increase bus shelters.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#16552



Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support





#16552



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support



#16552



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16555**



Reduce the number of institutions appropriately

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16555**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#16555



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know



#16555



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introducing more technological advancements into municipal government services, particularly artificial intelligence technology, to enhance efficiency and service quality

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#16557**



Try to make things cheaper and reduce taxes as much as possible

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Enhance the availability of complimentary parking by augmenting the number of parking spaces and enlarging the capacity of parking facilities.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the management structure of the public transportation authority of AT and reduce the number of buses operating idle during late hours

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#16557**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#16557



By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16557



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance and upkeep

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**



#16557



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	These priorities fully reflect the needs of residents and the direction of regional development

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Expand charitable English teaching and training, as well as skill training tailored for middle-aged and elderly individuals

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16558**



Reduce unnecessary expenses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reduce traffic congestion and improve travel efficiency

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Reduce fuel taxes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The road maintenance duration is too long, and the workers are paying too much.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Absorb more funds for better construction

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16558**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional company management leads to significant improvements in performance and returns

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

We can participate together

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**





#16558



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

Tell us why:

Derived from the people, used for the people

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#16558



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Enhance work efficiency and service quality

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the idle time of buses



**#16560**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the management structure of the public transportation authority of AT and reduce the number of buses operating idle during late hours

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Financial issues

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Financing needs in Auckland

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16560**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#16560



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Do not support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	Do not support
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Do not support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#16560



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

### Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

### Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#16560



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Policies that are beneficial are supported by everyone

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The municipal government aims to introduce more technology to enhance the level of artificial intelligence and improve the quality of services provided.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16561**



Reduce the spraying of pesticides near residential houses, especially in nearby areas, or refrain from spraying altogether

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the management structure of the public transportation authority of AT and reduce the number of buses operating idle during late hours

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

### **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#16561**



**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The professional management of the company will lead to significant improvements in operational efficiency and financial performance

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be strategically utilized across various aspects of municipal operations to maximize their impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#16561



**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16561



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance and upkeep

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#16561



## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	These priorities fully reflect the needs of residents and the direction of regional development

Tell us why



**#16561**



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage





**#16562**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Education

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce administrative institutions

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Maintaining NHS benefits the community, economy and cultural heritage, we need a place to hold/host major event on the shore. There are more pros than cons if we preserve NHS.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16562**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

1. It generates hundreds and thousands of jobs.
2. We need to it for the supply chain.
3. Ports have lower carbon emissions compared to air freight,we need a more balanced and well-functioning port in Auckland!

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#16562



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#16562



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

### Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	Do more
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do less
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	Do less
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16563**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16563



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>





#16563



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16565**



Reduce the number of institutions appropriately

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#16565



Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in	Support



#16565



2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16566**



Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses. Adjust property taxes and water fees accordingly

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

## **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

## **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### **Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

### **Tell us why:**





**#16566**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits



#16566



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#16566



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

We can do more in terms of garbage cleaning work to improve work efficiency and service quality.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16567**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

It contributes to the development of transportation

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16567**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

With abundant service funds, execution becomes more powerful.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

We can participate together.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16567



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16567



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16568**



Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Add extra lanes in motor way(traffic jam period,such as Northcote to sunnynook)

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bike track

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets Auckland's financing needs for effective management and implementation

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16568**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#16568



**Tell us why:**

Derived from the people, used for the people

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16568



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Youth education

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the frequency of late-night bus services to avoid excessive waste.



**#16569**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Improving public transportation for the benefit of ordinary citizens.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Primary and secondary education.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Expenditure on bicycle lanes.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Ensure the normal operation of existing sports stadiums.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Increase parliamentary revenue



**#16569**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Increase revenue

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

With abundant service funds, execution becomes more powerful.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

We can participate together

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years





#16569



Tell us why:

Derived from the people, used for the people

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support



#16569



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

I hope that municipal services can introduce more advanced technology, improve the level of artificial intelligence, and enhance service quality

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16572**



Reduce unnecessary expenses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Enhance the quality of maintenance for sports stadium areas

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#16572



By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16572



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#16574**



Reduce the spraying of pesticides, especially near residential houses or adjacent areas, or refrain from spraying herbicides altogether

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16574**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#16574



By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16574



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

I don’t know

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

## 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

## 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

### Tell us why:



**#16575**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16575



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>





#16575



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Enhance work and service efficiency

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16580**



Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses. Adjust property taxes and water fees accordingly

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Agree with the transportation development needs

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Maintain

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16580**



Not in need of short-term equity

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Agree

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits



#16580



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#16580



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Reasonable

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Medical care and enhance artificial intelligence technology

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16582**



The city council organization members should be streamlined, reducing the number of managers. We need to save on daily operations. The printing and paper expenses for this accountability are too extravagant, too expensive, and too wasteful. I hope that the newly established Auckland Future Fund management department is a small, capable, and efficient organization. I don't want it to be a large, valueless entity that only spends money without generating returns. The department hopes to be more altruistic.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree to stop raising pedestrian crossings and bike lanes, but I disagree with removing existing raised roads. It's unnecessary and costly in terms of money, effort, and time.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Currently, the utilization rate is very low, resulting in a lot of waste. We need to make the most of our resources.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal





**#16582**



**Tell us why:**

If the future fund can ensure that the proceeds from selling airport equity generate enough profit, and the net profit exceeds the sum of existing equity returns and future fund operating expenses, then it can proceed. Otherwise, these funds should gradually decrease and eventually disappear. The future fund should be an efficient organization with few personnel but capable of accomplishing much.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Maintain city council ownership of the port, but dividends should not be distributed. Instead, it should be for the people, by the people. Timely savings are necessary so that Auckland can have funds and profits for future development.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Save the profits for Auckland's future fund management, part of which will be used to fund city council services. Another part will be saved for unforeseen emergencies.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The city council should maintain the service and ownership of Auckland Port and its land, avoiding short-term gains at the expense of long-term benefits.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Other



#16582



**Tell us why:**

There's a need for change, seeking more benefits through this change.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The city council should now explore the possibility of relocating the oil port to another area. With Auckland's development, the current port cannot be beautified, and the city remains unattractive. As Auckland develops, the port should be transformed into a more commercially vibrant business district.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16582



the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

The amount of garbage disposal and the associated fee should be determined based on individual usage, without relying on property taxes.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#16582**



Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**

These priorities fully reflect the needs and direction of both residents and the region.



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Primary and secondary education

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce unnecessary expenses



**#16583**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Improving public transportation for the benefit of ordinary citizens

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Primary and secondary education

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Maintain the normal operation of existing sports stadiums

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Increase parliamentary revenue

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Increase revenue

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

We can participate together

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#16583



**Tell us why:**

Derived from the people, used for the people

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>





#16583



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The government provides more subsidies for the elderly

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the idle rate of buses



**#16584**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs



**#16584**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#16584



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#16584



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our	
--	--



#16584



community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	I hope that people's lives will continue to improve

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	Do more
<b>Water</b>	Do more
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	Do more
<b>Parks and Community</b>	Do more
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Medical care and housing

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Property tax and utility bills.





**#16586**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase free parking spaces

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

Sports facilities in residential areas

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16586**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**



#16586



**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>



#16586



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16587**



Reduce property taxes and utility bills; consider replacing buses with smaller vehicles to avoid waste

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Replacing buses with smaller vehicles to avoid waste

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16587**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#16587



**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>





#16587



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16588**



I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

In Long Bay, mainly increase bus shelters.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**



#16588



4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

I don't know

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

I don't know

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in	Other



#16588



<p>harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



**#16588**



**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Construct more facilities convenient for bicycle use to reduce the cost of public transportation

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16589**



Repair fewer roads that are already in good condition to save costs. Automate traffic management as much as possible to save on manpower costs

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

This plan can improve traffic flow rates, encourage citizens to use public transportation, thereby reducing fuel pollution, saving energy, and protecting the environment

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Change the operational management

**Tell us why:**

Changing the operational mode to increase utilization and generate revenue

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Establish an investment fund to generate revenue and better utilize real estate to increase municipal funding sources





**#16589**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Advance payments can promptly address certain funding gaps, reducing the interest costs incurred by the city council's debt and liabilities

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Allocate a portion to the future fund, while using another portion to fund critical emergency services for the council.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

These two wharves have limited area and generate limited cash flow. It might be better to use them for other purposes to benefit the community.



#16589



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

This option can continue to provide funds for the Auckland port.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16589



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Expand charitable English teaching and skill training

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16590**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Reduce traffic congestion and improve travel efficiency

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Reduce fuel taxes

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

The road maintenance duration is too long, and the workers are paying too much.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

I have not participated.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Absorb more funds for better construction



**#16590**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**



#16590



This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Other
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide	



#16590



increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
---	--





#16590



<p>Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.</p>	
<p>Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.</p>	
<p>Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.</p>	
<p>Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.</p>	<p>I support this, as it can make our lives better and better</p>

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16591**



Reduce the spraying of pesticides, especially near residential houses or adjacent areas, or refrain from spraying herbicides altogether

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#16591**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16591



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#16591



Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

<b>Transport</b>	As proposed
<b>Water</b>	As proposed
<b>City and local development</b>	As proposed
<b>Environment and regulation</b>	As proposed
<b>Parks and Community</b>	As proposed
<b>Economic and cultural development</b>	As proposed
<b>Council support</b>	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16592**



Reduce the frequency of late-night bus services to avoid excessive waste.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Optimize the rational structure of public transportation to reduce the number of buses idling.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**





**#16592**



Establish an investment fund to generate revenue and better utilize real estate to increase municipal funding sources

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16592



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#16592



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16593**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Optimize the rational structure of public transportation to reduce the number of buses idling.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#16593**



The plan meets Auckland's financing needs for effective management and implementation

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16593



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#16593



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16594**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets financing requirements and is conducive to governance and practical implementation.



**#16594**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16594



**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16594



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16595**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets financing requirements and is conducive to governance and practical implementation.



**#16595**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area





#16595



**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16595



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16596**



Reduce the frequency of late-night bus services to avoid excessive waste.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

We need sufficient sports venues and large event spaces.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets financing requirements and is conducive to governance and practical implementation.



**#16596**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16596



**Tell us why:**

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16596



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Establishing a dedicated property tax can provide sustainable financial resources to meet the needs of environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#16597**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets financing requirements and is conducive to governance and practical implementation.



**#16597**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16597



**Tell us why:**

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16597



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Establishing a dedicated property tax can sustain the fiscal resources needed for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16601**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Do not support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Enhance the availability of complimentary parking by augmenting the number of parking spaces and enlarging the capacity of parking facilities.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The facilities are outdated, and the surrounding residential structure has changed, making it suitable for redevelopment.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The municipal government-operated enterprises are managed and updated by the city government itself, reflecting citizen participation

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Changing the port infrastructure poses environmental challenges, and the renovation costs are difficult to control.



#16601



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The location is suitable for developing exhibition venues for large-scale events.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>





#16601



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

Not supportive of changing the current situation.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16605**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16605



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16605



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Improving public transportation and traffic networks, upgrading technology, and enhancing quality.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16608**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

These transportation infrastructure projects have long investment timelines, slow results, and may contribute to pollution.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the AT structure to avoid wasting personnel.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

The facilities are outdated, and the surrounding residential structure has changed, making it suitable for redevelopment.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**





**#16608**



The shares are fundamental

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The municipal government-operated enterprises are managed and updated by the city government itself, reflecting citizen participation

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

It can alleviate the financial pressure of levying property taxes and other fees.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

Expanding benefits through mode conversion.



#16608



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16608



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16609**



Reduce the frequency of late-night bus services to avoid excessive waste.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

We need sufficient sports venues and large event spaces.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets financing requirements and is conducive to governance and practical implementation.



**#16609**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#16609



**Tell us why:**

This operational area brings employment and facilitates unloading for Auckland.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16609



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16615**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I support anything beneficial to the public.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Clearing illegally parked cars obstructing traffic. Placing orange cones to block off the area

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**



#16615



**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.

Do not support



#16615



<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b>.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	<p></p>
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of</p>	<p>Support</p>



**#16615**



around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## **Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16628**



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#16628



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

Tell us here:

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>





#16628



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#16628**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**



#16632



Continue to use it to fund council services

Tell us here:

4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?

Tell us here:

5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

Tell us why:

5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16632



for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**



**#16632**



## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The government provides more subsidies for the elderly

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the idle rate of buses





**#16831**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs



**#16831**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**



#16831



Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Do not support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Do not support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing	Do not support



#16831



the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our	
--	--



#16831



community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	I hope that people's lives will continue to improve

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Enhance work efficiency and service quality

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the idle time of buses



**#16832**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the management structure of the public transportation authority of AT and reduce the number of buses operating idle during late hours

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Financial issues

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Financing needs in Auckland

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16832**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**





#16832



<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	



#16832



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**

**More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?**

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through	



#16832



methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	Policies that are beneficial are supported by everyone

**Tell us why**

**7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?**

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introducing more technological advancements into municipal government services, particularly artificial intelligence technology, to enhance efficiency and service quality

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16836**



Try to make things cheaper and reduce taxes as much as possible

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Enhance the availability of complimentary parking by augmenting the number of parking spaces and enlarging the capacity of parking facilities.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the management structure of the public transportation authority of AT and reduce the number of buses operating idle during late hours

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**



**#16836**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

Could alleviate increased property taxes and other expenses to ease the burden

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**



#16836



By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16836



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance and upkeep

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays

**Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities**

**7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?**





#16836



More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	These priorities fully reflect the needs of residents and the direction of regional development

Tell us why

7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16840**



Reduce the idle rate of buses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16840**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

There will be significant improvements in all aspects

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits



#16840



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16840



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

The municipal government aims to introduce more technology to enhance the level of artificial intelligence and improve the quality of services provided.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16841**



Reduce the spraying of pesticides near residential houses, especially in nearby areas, or refrain from spraying altogether

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the management structure of the public transportation authority of AT and reduce the number of buses operating idle during late hours

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding





**#16841**



**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The professional management of the company will lead to significant improvements in operational efficiency and financial performance

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be strategically utilized across various aspects of municipal operations to maximize their impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#16841



**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16841



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Do not support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance and upkeep

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Hibiscus and Bays



#16841



## Hibiscus and Bays Local Board Priorities

7b. What do you think of our proposed priorities for Hibiscus and Bays in 2024/2025?

More specifically, what do you think of each priority we've listed above?

Support the development of community led resilience networks in our area, so our community and organisations will know who does what, where to get information and how to help, including in emergencies.	
Support and advocate for further protection of our sea, soil and fresh water from contamination and sedimentation through methods such as re-naturalisation, or daylighting.	
Engage with our community and key stakeholders, including mana whenua, on the future uses of our undeveloped reserves, and older established ones, including investigation of cost-effective options for other informal recreation and play in these areas.	
Continue to support activities that promote vibrancy, diversity and showcases creativity in our area, such as events, festivals, and other shared experiences in our public spaces for all.	
Continue to renew and enhance the paths network (greenways) to create a safer, off road, well-connected networks for active modes of transport.	These priorities fully reflect the needs of residents and the direction of regional development

Tell us why



**#16841**



7c. What do you think of the Hibiscus and Bays proposed priorities for the 10-year budget 2024-2034?

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16844**



Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Add extra lanes in motor way(traffic jam period,such as Northcote to sunnynook)

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Bike track

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets Auckland's financing needs for effective management and implementation

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16844**



Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years





#16844



**Tell us why:**

Derived from the people, used for the people

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16844



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Other
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Other

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	As proposed

1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

### 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?



**#16847**



Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

In Long Bay, mainly increase bus shelters.

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**



#16847



Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

Resume the **Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)** and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in

Do not support



#16847



<p>the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	Do not support
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	Do not support
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	Support
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	I don't know
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	Support
<p>Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.</p>	
<p>Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.</p>	Do not support



#16847



Increase the **Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate** from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.

I don't know

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?





**#16848**



Reduce the number of institutions appropriately

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16848**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

I don't know



#16848



Tell us why:

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	I don't know
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	I don't know
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know



#16848



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	I don't know

6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?

## Local board priorities

7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?

Upper Harbour

8. Do you have any other comments?



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage



**#16849**



**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Education

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Reduce administrative institutions

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

Maintaining NHS benefits the community, economy and cultural heritage, we need a place to hold/host major event on the shore. There are more pros than cons if we preserve NHS.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16849**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

1. It generates hundreds and thousands of jobs.
2. We need to it for the supply chain.
3. Ports have lower carbon emissions compared to air freight,we need a more balanced and well-functioning port in Auckland!

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**



#16849



Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	





#16849



Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	I don't know
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16850**



Reduce property taxes and utility bills; consider replacing buses with smaller vehicles to avoid waste

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Replacing buses with smaller vehicles to avoid waste

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

I don't know

**Tell us why:**

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**



**#16850**



I don't know

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years



#16850



**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16850



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16851**



Reduce the frequency of nighttime bus services in certain areas to minimize wastage caused by empty buses. Adjust property taxes and water fees accordingly

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**





The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Municipally owned enterprises operated directly by the city government can better reflect citizen involvement

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits



#16851



5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

Tell us why:

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

6a. What do you think of these proposals?

Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.	Support
Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.	Support
Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).	Support
Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	Support
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Support



#16851



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16852**



Reduce late-night bus services in certain areas to avoid wasting resources.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spots and parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Proceed with the proposal

**Tell us why:**

The plan meets financing requirements and is conducive to governance and practical implementation.



**#16852**



**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and lease the operation of the port for a period of about 35 years and use the upfront payment from the lease to invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

I don't know

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area



#16852



**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.</p>	<p>Support</p>



#16852



Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do more (increase council services/ investment), with higher rates increases and more debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do more
Water	Do more
City and local development	Do more
Environment and regulation	Do more
Parks and Community	Do more
Economic and cultural development	Do more
Council support	Do more

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



Reduce the spraying of pesticides, especially near residential houses or adjacent areas, or refrain from spraying herbicides altogether

## 2. What do you think of the transport proposal?

Support all of the proposal

### Tell us why:

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

## 2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

## 2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

## 3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

### Tell us why:

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

## 4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?

Proceed with the proposal

### Tell us why:



**#16853**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional operation will improve and enhance efficiency, performance, and returns.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum impact

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.

**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, maximize the benefits generated by the assets.



#16853



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b></p>	<p>Support</p>



#16853



Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated land tax to maintain sustainable financial resources required for environmental governance.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	Do less
Water	Do less
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	Do less
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introducing more technologies, especially with the rise of AI, to improve work efficiency and service quality.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16854**



Reduce late-night services, in most areas and on buses, to avoid wastage due to a large number of empty vehicles

## **2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Don't support any of the proposal

### **Tell us why:**

These transportation infrastructure projects require long investment periods and have slow effects, while also causing pollution.

### **2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Enhance the availability of complimentary parking by augmenting the number of parking spaces and enlarging the capacity of parking facilities.

### **2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify the organizational structure of AT to avoid personnel waste.

## **3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

### **Tell us why:**

The facilities are outdated, and the surrounding residential structure has changed, making it suitable for redevelopment.

## **4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding



**#16854**



**Tell us why:**

The shares of Auckland Airport are backed by Auckland's long-term financial support, making it unsuitable for short-term investment.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

The municipal government-operated enterprises are managed and updated by the city government itself, reflecting citizen participation

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Continue to use it to fund council services

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be utilized to achieve maximum effectiveness.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

No change – leave Captain Cook and Marsden wharves to be managed as part of the port operations

**Tell us why:**

Changing the port infrastructure poses environmental challenges and makes cost control difficult.





#16854



**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The location is suitable for developing exhibition venues for large-scale events.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16854



Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out <b>of rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

## Local board priorities

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Devonport-Takapuna

**8. Do you have any other comments?**



# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Do less (reduce council services/ investment), lower rates increases and less debt

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	Do less
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	Do less
Economic and cultural development	Do less
Council support	Do less

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?

The city council organization members should be streamlined, reducing the number of managers. We need to save on daily operations. The printing and paper expenses for this accountability are too extravagant, too expensive, and too wasteful. I hope that the



**#16856**



newly established Auckland Future Fund management department is a small, capable, and efficient organization. I don't want it to be a large, valueless entity that only spends money without generating returns. The department hopes to be more altruistic.

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support most of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

I agree to stop raising pedestrian crossings and bike lanes, but I disagree with removing existing raised roads. It's unnecessary and costly in terms of money, effort, and time.

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Consider redeveloping the stadium precinct

**Tell us why:**

Currently, the utilization rate is very low, resulting in a lot of waste. We need to make the most of our resources.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Other

**Tell us why:**



**#16856**



If the future fund can ensure that the proceeds from selling airport equity generate enough profit, and the net profit exceeds the sum of existing equity returns and future fund operating expenses, then it can proceed. Otherwise, these funds should gradually decrease and eventually disappear. The future fund should be an efficient organization with few personnel but capable of accomplishing much.

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

I agree with the basic idea, with the condition that the future fund management department must undergo strict scrutiny. It should be efficient, low-cost, and high-yielding. Otherwise, the billions of dollars in funds will gradually decrease year by year, eventually running out, making Auckland even more difficult.

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Other

**Tell us here:**

Part of the savings should be used for subsidies, and part should be invested in the Auckland Future Fund.

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

The city council should maintain the service and ownership of Auckland Port and its land, avoiding short-term gains at the expense of long-term benefits.

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

I don't know



#16856



**Tell us why:**

There is a need for change, and through this change, we seek greater benefits.

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Transfer Bledisloe Terminal to council to be used for something else, that provides public benefit, within 15 years

**Tell us why:**

The city council should now explore the possibility of relocating the maritime port to another location, such as a suitable place in southern Auckland. With Auckland's development, the current port should be developed into a more profitable public commercial district. This would beautify the city and generate more revenue.

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>I don't know</p>



#16856



Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers. We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	I don't know
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools.</b>	I don't know
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	I don't know
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

The current pay-as-you-throw system is reasonable. It also serves as an educational opportunity for citizens about environmental awareness. Businesses, especially foreign enterprises operating locally, profit from doing business here. They have a greater social responsibility.

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**



**#16856**



Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**





# Long-term Plan 2024-2034

Note: this simplified version of the feedback form has been created for the purpose of publishing submissions. As such, contact and demographic information has been removed, and handwritten submissions have been transcribed.

## Submitter details:

Organisation (if applicable):

Local Board: Upper Harbour

## Your feedback

### 1a. Which option do you prefer for the overall direction for council’s Long-term Plan?

Proceed with the central proposal

### 1b. What would you like Auckland Council to do more or less of?

Transport	As proposed
Water	As proposed
City and local development	As proposed
Environment and regulation	As proposed
Parks and Community	As proposed
Economic and cultural development	As proposed
Council support	As proposed

### 1c. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do more of that you would be prepared to pay more for?

Introduce more scientific and technological advancements, enhance artificial intelligence technology, and improve the quality of work and services.

### 1d. Is there anything else you would like Auckland Council to do less of so that you could pay less?



**#16857**



Reduce the idle rate of buses

**2. What do you think of the transport proposal?**

Support all of the proposal

**Tell us why:**

Meets the transportation development needs of Auckland

**2a. Is there anything you would spend more on?**

Increase the number of free parking spaces and expand the quantity of parking lots

**2b. Is there anything you would spend less on?**

Simplify AT management and reduce the number of buses idling

**3. Which options do you support for the North Harbour Stadium?**

Keep the stadium precinct as it is

**Tell us why:**

With a large local population, there is a need to maintain more large-scale sports and event venues.

**4a. What is your preference on the proposal to establish an Auckland Future Fund and transfer Auckland Council's shareholding in Auckland International Airport Limited (AIAL) into this fund (enabling the shares to be sold)?**

Don't proceed with establishing an Auckland Future Fund and transferring AIAL shareholding

**Tell us why:**



**#16857**



The shares of Auckland Airport serve as a long-term financial support for the city and are not suitable for short-term financing needs

**4b. Which option do you prefer for the future of Port of Auckland?**

Retain underlying council ownership of port land and wharves, and continue council group operation of the port (through Port of Auckland Limited), and implement the plan to deliver improved profitability and more dividends to council

**Tell us here:**

Professional company management leads to significant improvements in performance and returns

**4c. If the council group continues to operate the Port of Auckland how would you prefer the profits and dividends to be used?**

Invest in the proposed Auckland Future Fund

**Tell us here:**

These funds can be strategically utilized across the entire market to maximize their effectiveness

**4d. Do you have any feedback on any other part of the proposal?**

**Tell us here:**

With a large local population, it's necessary to maintain an adequate number of sports facilities and recreational venues

**5a. What option do you prefer for Captain Cook and Marsden wharves?**

Proceed with the proposal to transfer Captain Cook and Marsden wharves from the port to Auckland Council so they can be used for something else that provides public benefit.



#16857



**Tell us why:**

By transitioning the operational model, optimize the efficiency of asset management to maximize benefits

**5b. What option do you prefer for Bledisloe Terminal?**

Keep Bledisloe Terminal as a Port of Auckland operational area

**Tell us why:**

It can bring employment opportunities to Auckland and facilitate convenient unloading

**6a. What do you think of these proposals?**

<p>Resume the <b>Natural Environment Targeted Rate (NETR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 so we can continue to invest in the protection of native ecosystems and species. This increases rates for the average value residential property by around \$20.04 and \$152.71 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Resume the <b>Water Quality Targeted Rate (WQTR)</b> and extend it to 2034/2035 at a level to only cover the annual programme operating and interest costs. This ensures that we can continue to fund the water quality improvements in harbours and streams across the region, at a lower amount for next year than previously planned. This reduces this rate from what was previously planned for the average value residential property by around \$6.53 and \$17.10 for the average value business property.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Broaden the description of bus services funded by the <b>Climate Action Transport Targeted Rate (CATTR)</b> to reduce the need to consult each year for minor changes to the bus programme (any changes to the settings of the CATTR would still require consultation).</p>	<p>Do not support</p>
<p>Discontinue the <b>Long Term Differential Strategy</b> which gradually lowers the share of general rates paid by businesses and raises the share paid by other ratepayers.</p>	<p>Do not support</p>



#16857



We also propose to raise the share businesses pay of the NETR, WQTR, and CATTR to align to the general rate.	
Re-introduce <b>recycling charges for schools</b> .	Do not support
Continue the planned roll out of <b>rates funded refuse collection</b> to the North Shore, Waitākere and Papakura in 2024/2025, and Franklin and Rodney in 2025/2026, replacing the current pay as you throw service, and consequent rates change.	Do not support
Introduce the <b>Franklin Local Board Paths Targeted Rate</b> of \$52 per SUIP (Separately Used or Inhabited Part) to provide increased investment in paths in the Franklin Local Board area.	
Change the <b>Rodney Drainage Districts Targeted Rate</b> to reflect public feedback and updated analysis of the benefits to properties and boundaries.	Do not support
Increase the <b>Waitākere Rural Sewerage Targeted Rate</b> from \$296.75 to \$336.80 (per year) for the 2024/2025, 2025/2026, and 2026/2027 years to maintain cost recovery in the three-year contract cycle, and avoid an annual subsidy of around \$117,000 from general rates, with the next cost review scheduled for the 2027/2028 year.	Do not support

**6b. Do you have any other feedback on the proposals in question 6a, the changes to our Revenue and Financing Policy, or other changes to fees and charges?**

It is necessary to establish a dedicated property tax

**Local board priorities**

**7a. Which local board area does your feedback relate to?**

Upper Harbour

**8. Do you have any other comments?**